

THE  
AMERICAN QUARTERLY  
CHURCH REVIEW.

---

---

VOL. XI.

JANUARY, 1859.

No. 4.

---

---

ART. I.—THE AMERICAN UNION.—ITS NATURE AND ORIGIN.

1. *History of the Origin, Formation, and Adoption of the Constitution of the United States ; with notices of its Principal Framers.* By GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1854. 1858.
2. *Two Lectures on the History of the American Union.* By HENRY REED, late Professor of English History in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: Parry & Mc Millan.

THESE Lectures of Professor Reed are very beautiful, and very suggestive. Mr. Curtis in his elaborate work gathers into moderate compass materials which were scattered in many volumes, and enriches every part of the collection with a concise but luminous commentary. No reading man should be satisfied with a less amount of knowledge of the Constitution than is here conveyed ; and it would be utterly disgraceful for



any one, who aspires to an active participation in the administration of this government, not to have mastered at least so much of the principles which lie at the foundation of our complex system.

The history of the Constitution is the best commentary upon the Constitution, and the most effectual vindication of every one of its principles and compromises.

It is a fashion with some men, of strong feeling and narrow mind, to sneer at the idea of a compromise, as if it were necessarily a concession of right to wrong—the weak admission of a certain measure of evil, in place of unmixed good. Undoubtedly this is the aspect in which each particular compromise must present itself to the heated partisans of opposing principles and extreme opinions; which are brought by this expedient from hurtful hostility into happy reconciliation and useful coöperation. But the philosophic statesman, even in the excitement of the conflict, and all sensible men afterwards, can see that the compromise is in fact the admission and triumph of the right, and the defeat only of the wrong in each of the opposing propositions. Such is eminently the case with all the compromises which make up the American Constitution. The government of the whole Creation presents a glorious harmony brought out by the Divine intelligence from the conflict of opposing forces. The Constitution of the United States is the resultant harmony of the conflicting facts, interests, and principles, of our national existence, composed and arranged by the intelligence and patriotism of the Fathers of the Republic.

The American Constitution is no closet work, framed to order, and realizing some beautiful theory of human rights, and political perfection. Such things, like Plato's Republic, and Moore's Utopia, and the many Constitutions of the Abbe Sieges, are incapable of application to the actual government of men. All real and effective government must be a growth out of the condition, character and history of a people. Many of the framers of the Constitution had their own favorite theories of government; but none of these were adopted as the basis of the system they gave to the country. So far as theory was admitted into that instrument at all, it has already proved a failure. But the main fabric of the Constitution is something far more permanent and real. It is the wise adjustment, and patient and conciliatory reconciliation, of the actual facts, and conflicting interests, and well established principles, of our previous condition.

The two leading plans of government brought before the



Constitutional Convention were called, respectively, the Virginia, and the New Jersey, plan. The first proposed simply a National government, the second a pure Confederation. Neither of these plans were mere theories. Each was the result of the most matured and practical wisdom of the day, working upon the materials furnished by the actual character and position of the country. But each was one-sided and defective, because the human mind is so. Neither one admitted and provided for all the facts and circumstances of the case. Each presented clearly, and made ample provision for, one class of facts and interests, but almost entirely ignored the other and conflicting class. Neither plan, therefore, could have worked successfully and efficiently, even if it had been accepted by the Convention and the people.

The plan of a Confederation ignored the most material fact of the whole case—that the people of the United States were One, in their origin, not only, but had always been one people, in their history and in their allegiance. The National scheme left too much out of view the other great and material fact—that, in subordination to this unity and common allegiance, each State had always been a separate and independent power, possessing the ordinary machinery, and exercising the ordinary functions of government.

When the opposing facts and interests represented by these two schemes of government met together in the Convention, it was found that all of them were too real, too vital, too energetic, to be destroyed or neglected; but must of necessity be accepted, and placed in their rightful position of power and authority in the new government. The advocates of each scheme were, therefore, at first disappointed; but they soon found that such a defeat was the triumph of truth and reality, and, therefore, their own best and most glorious triumph.

The history now given to us by Mr. Curtis, presents these facts in all their force. But, strange to say, that gentleman seems to have had a very dim and insufficient conception of one side of the great truth—the essential oneness of the American people in every period of their history. We are surprised to find such incautious expressions as the following, from so accurate a thinker. "The colonies had no direct political connection with each other before the Revolution commenced." "We have seen the American people,—divided into separate and isolated communities, without nationality, except such as resulted from a general community of origin." Vol. I, p. 7, p. 383.

But surely, this common origin, not only, but one common



allegiance, one language, one generous feeling of loyalty, a common sense of dependence on the Mother Country for defense and protection, the universal recognition of a common government in all the highest attributes and functions of sovereignty, constituted, at all times, a common Nationality, most real, pervading, and effective. James Wilson of Pennsylvania, stated the case in the Convention much more accurately, as reported by Mr. Curtis. "During the war, he had always considered the States, with respect to that war, as forming one community; and he did not admit the idea, that, when the Colonies became independent of Great Britain, they became independent of each other."

The Revolution, in separating us from Great Britain, left us still one people. The Revolutionary government assumed and acted upon that fact, and took the place of the government that had been renounced. The Articles of Confederation, subsequently adopted, ignored that fact, *under the influence of theory*, and was one grand mistake. It therefore broke down at once, an utter and ignominious failure. But even this abortive effort at a government formed a substantive part of the growth of the Constitution, by demonstrating, at the right time, its own intrinsic insufficiency and worthlessness.

The admirable lectures of Professor Reed bring out very distinctly the great fact, that the American Constitution is a growth ordered by the superintending care of Divine Providence. The lamented Professor adduces many circumstances in our past history to strengthen and confirm this conclusion. Referring to the lectures for these details, we propose now to show the pregnant meaning and signification of that great and complex fact which God Himself has wrought out of our past history; the essential nationality and oneness of the people of the United States, and the distinct sovereignty of each of the several States.

That the Almighty Disposer of human events has called the people of this country to a great work, and to a glorious concurrence with Him in the progressive elevation of mankind, is manifest from many circumstances of our national history.

The recent subjection of a pure and virgin continent to the sway of that Teutonic race which had already proved itself to be before and above all other races for perseverance, endurance, indomitable energy, the spirit of adventure, and strong common sense, as distinguished from genius; the peculiar political, civil, social, and religious education, in the parent country, of that branch of this strong stock which was first



engaged in the colonization of America: the hardships, privations, and incessant struggles by which a wild and rugged country, claimed by the fiercest savages in the world, was slowly and gradually subdued, thus adding force and intensity to all the national characteristics: the gradual commingling with this original population, of the best blood of Europe, driven hither by persecution, or allured by the spirit of adventure and the pursuit of fortune: the wondrously felicitous situation of the continent given to the race so admirably and variously trained, that continent extending from ocean to ocean, in equal communication with the earliest and latest seats of empire and civilization: all these facts conspire to show that God has called us to a station high above all people in working out His purposes of good will to men.

It is only necessary to refer to that old world discipline by which Providence, in its slow and stately march, had prepared and furnished the elements of the American character. All of us are familiar with the millennial contest waged in England under successive dynasties, with changing fortune, but with unchanging perseverance and determination, for *civil freedom*, and for *constitutional* government. We know the incidents of that fiercer and more stirring battle, so gloriously fought on the same ground by the same ancestry, for *religious freedom*, for the right to think, for the power to hold communion with God our Father, on the terms which He has Himself prescribed. By the issue of that mighty struggle, Priestly Despotism, the most malign dominion to which the human soul for its ignorance and unfaithfulness has ever been subjected, was thrown off from them and from their children forever. The agitations and convulsions among the conquerors in this last contest, was indeed a shameful abuse of their newly acquired liberty. But this very abuse was overruled by the Almighty, to be the means of exercising and developing to their utmost capacity all the best powers of noblest manhood.

Then came the American part of the discipline by which our countrymen were prepared for the mighty work which Providence had assigned to them. A few adventurous spirits transferred to this country the character, the freedom, the civil and municipal institutions, so nobly won at home. Here a wilderness was to be subdued; treacherous savages watched, propitiated, conquered. Here an empire was to be founded, and the administration of a self-sustaining government to become the familiar duty of every gentleman.

Every thoughtful man must see how God was working in history to form the generation of true men who achieved the



revolution, and maintained and gave a higher form and development to those free institutions which are at once the pride of America and the hope of the world.

Let us look at those principles of government and of social order which these strong men recognized and vindicated as the firm and only foundation of American liberty, and of the hopes of the world which spring from that liberty.

All government is founded upon the imperfection of human nature. If all men were sufficiently intelligent and good, there would be no necessity for government. For, every one performing perfectly his own duty in his own sphere, would most effectually promote the common good, and the general happiness. But man is not so happily constituted. He is so selfish that each one will pursue his own ends, and gratify his own desires, at the expense of the rights and happiness of his fellows. And he is so short sighted, that no one person can be trusted to determine absolutely for his own action the best means of promoting private or public prosperity. Hence it is necessary, not only for man's wellbeing, but for his very existence, that there should be placed over him a government, with large, controlling, and stringent powers. These powers are otherwise called sovereignty; and upon their right and proper exercise depend the welfare of the whole community, and the peace and happiness of each one of its members.

In a simple government, the whole or nearly the whole of this immense power is lodged in a single depository. In all former precedents, with the exception of the troubled but illustrious democracy of Athens, this depository has been a single person, or a small body of nobles, or an armed soldiery.

But the same vice of human nature which renders government necessary, demonstrates this to be a most injurious and oppressive form of government. Experience has given a melancholy confirmation to this teaching of right reason; and in the multiplied miseries and oppressions of despotism proclaims, that no one man, or body of men, has sufficient intelligence or goodness to be entrusted with so much power.

This experience of mankind has led, under the guidance of Divine Providence, to the gradual growth and consolidation of limited and complicated governments. The principle of these mixed governments is, that the vast powers necessary to constitute an efficient civil government, shall be so divided between a number of distinct and independent depositaries, and the interests and feelings of these several holders of the sovereign power, shall be so various and contrariant, that they may check and restrain each other, when either wishes to do



harm; and only combine and move harmoniously together when they are striving to carry out the legitimate purposes of government.

The Roman Republic and the Constitutional Monarchy of Great Britain were the grandest and the most beneficent illustrations of this form of government, that the world had seen previous to the firm establishment of the American Constitution.

The framers of the Federal Constitution undoubtedly intended to construct every part of their work upon this admirable principle. With the nature and happy efficacy of the principle, they were perfectly familiar by their knowledge of the British Constitution, and by their own personal experience in the working of the Colonial Governments. They tried, therefore, to incorporate the same beneficent provision into all the arrangements and details of the Federal Government. Upon paper that Constitution is very intricate and complicated. The several powers embraced within the terms of the Constitution, are carefully separated from each other, and confided, as was supposed, to distinct and independent agencies; making, to all appearance, a beautiful and effective system of checks and balances.

But the venerable framers of the Constitution entirely overlooked, in their estimate of the practical working of this seemingly complex system, one immense and inappreciable power, the operation of which reduces to nothing all the well-adjusted theoretical distinctions between the departments of the Federal Government, by the ease with which it overbalances them all. This preponderating and crushing element in our system, is the direct and immediate agency of the whole people in all the conduct and administration of the government, ordinary as well as extraordinary.

That Sovereignty resides ultimately in the people, is a principle which lies at the foundation, perhaps, of all governments; certainly of all popular governments. But never before, unless a single Grecian City be an exception, was there founded a system of government in which the ordinary powers and attributes of sovereignty were designed to be vested exclusively in the great body of the people, to be by them directly and habitually exercised in the ordinary administration of affairs.

A variety of causes have concurred to produce in this age and country a result which never could have occurred before; and which, without the influence of our example, never would have been dreamed of in other lands. The chief causes to which this revolution is to be ascribed, are the gradual



introduction of Universal Suffrage; and the wonder-working power of the Press, which carries the decision of every question directly to the tribunal of this universal suffrage.

Does the great fact which we have announced in regard to the practical working of American institutions, require to be proved? Are there any who can be so deceived by the power of a name, that they cannot discover the reality of things, because the names designed and fitted for the theoretical and paper system are continued and applied to the actual and practical system? When the greatest of Republics became the greatest and most despotic of Empires, not a single name or title was changed. This mighty revolution was effected by the one solitary change, that all these titles and officers, Consuls, Censors, Tribunes, and all the rest, became thenceforth the expression of a *single will*, the will of the once subordinate Emperor, instead of the expression of the distinct and independent wills of different and conflicting estates and persons.

One fact will furnish a full illustration of the change that has passed upon a part of our system. The first officer of the government was designed to be chosen by the mature wisdom of Electoral Colleges, composed of men selected from the body of the people on account of their experience, judgment, and integrity. So many separate and independent bodies, thus admirably constituted, were deemed to be the best possible provision for the safe and wise discharge of the most difficult and dangerous feature of a republic, the election of a Chief Magistrate. It is well known, that, under the actual working system, the Electoral Colleges have never been anything but cumbrous and superfluous instruments for signifying to the central government the choice of the President, already made by the people in their primary assemblies. And it is very probable that the majority of the voters do not know that there is any such intermediate machinery, composing a part of our institutions. The practical working of this provision is but a type of the change that has passed upon the whole system.

With a most important exception, which will be noticed presently, a majority of the people is the sovereign power, the actual government, of the United States; and our system is, therefore, saving the exception above referred to, a *simple democracy*.

It is hardly to be expected, although the language of some of his courtiers and flatterers would intimate as much, that his Majesty, the Democracy, will be altogether exempt from the failings and vices which belong to other potentates, and



which attach to poor human nature in all conditions, and especially in high and elevated stations. On the contrary, experience has amply proved that his Democratic Majesty has a quantum sufficit of these ordinary vices and failings of royalty.

The most usual and the most fatal vice of royalty in its simple and despotic forms, is the constant tendency to surrender itself blindly to the guidance of every vile and worthless favorite, who, to gain his Master's confidence, has first stooped to lick the dust from his Master's feet; and who will carefully cultivate, and diligently pander to, all the monarch's basest passions, that he may obtain the fearful power to sacrifice the dearest rights of men to the promotion of his own low, and mean, and miserable purposes.

To this common fault of despotism, the Democratic Sovereign of these United States seems to be quite as much exposed as any other absolute monarch. It is true that in theory, the ear of his Majesty is equally open to every description of counselor. The honest and the dishonest portion of the public press, the high minded statesman, and the corrupt politician, may upon equal terms approach the throne. But which of these two classes of counselors will be most regarded and most successful? Will it be the stern patriot, who coldly addresses the reason of his Sovereign, who preaches all the virtues, and talks about those dull abstractions, justice and right? Or, will the supple courtier, who can lie, soothe, and flatter; who will rouse by artful appeals the slumbering passions of his Master, and who will minister to the gratification of that Master's lowest appetites, be most apt to win his way to favor and to power? Let history and experience tell. True it is, that sometimes the Democracy, like other Sovereigns, may be suddenly aroused from a long dream of security and pleasure by the rugged realities of adverse fortune; and for the moment he may rudely shake off the vile pests which have wooed him to his undoing. But these will be only transient and temporary triumphs of virtue and intelligence. The conclusion of right reason and of experience alike is, that a Simple Democracy will prove to be as destructive to freedom and to happiness as all the other simple and unmixed governments have been. But most happily our government is not an unmixed one.

In describing the process by which all the powers of government have been absorbed in the absolute sovereignty of a numerical majority of the people of the United States, thereby making our government a Simple Democracy, as dangerous to liberty as any other despotism, we have referred to one great exception to this result. That exception constitutes the one in-



valuable conservative element in our political institutions which gives to the whole system its only chance of success and permanency. The glorious exception is, *THE FACT, that all the powers necessary to complete sovereignty never were, and are not now vested in the government, or in the people of the United States. Nor were the whole of these powers ever vested in the people of a single State of this Union.*

What the wise and venerable framers of the Federal Constitution were unable to accomplish in regard to the several departments of that government, Divine Providence had already prepared for the American people, by the distribution of the powers of sovereignty between the Central government—the necessary expression of the original unity and nationality of the people—and the respective State governments, which had possessed and exercised a portion of these powers from the first settlement of the country.

Real governments cannot, as we have said, be made to order, but must be a growth out of circumstances, history, and national character, in the progress of which human wisdom, and God's superintending care, may concur and work together for the consummation of His merciful purpose in the happiness and elevation of mankind. Thanks be to that distinguishing Providence, which has exalted our land and people in blessings and privileges above all the nations of the earth, we have never been subjected to the crushing despotism of a Simple Government, either Autocratic or Democratic. The whole Federal Constitution is but one department of the government under which we live.

The wisdom of our Fathers was shown, not so much in their constructions, as in their clear recognition of what God, working through history, and upon national character, had already constructed for them; and in the care which they took for the perpetual maintenance and continued activity of that Divine work. That Divine provision, which the Constitution recognizes, and brings into living and constant action, consists of the two facts mentioned in the commencement of this Article—that the American people have always been one nation, under one common allegiance; and have always been divided into separate, and to some extent independent, sovereignties.

The question has often been mooted, whether the Federal government is the creature of the States, or whether the States derive their power from the grants and permissions of the Federal Constitution. Neither of the parties to this issue can prevail, for both the propositions are untrue. The people of the United States were always one people, and formed their



own Federal Constitution. The States were always distinct governments, and exercised the powers which they now possess.

This division of the functions of government between independent depositories, each of which possesses an inherent power to sustain itself, and to exercise its own rightful jurisdiction, constitutes a conservative element in our political system, the like to which in salutary efficiency has never been presented before in the history of nations. And it is the only permanent conservative element in our political system. For without this, the only other apparent element of conservatism, the independence of the Judiciary, could be swept away by a single decree of the Democratic Sovereign.

We have already given in detail the circumstances under which the Constitutional Convention, after long and earnest consultation and debate, adopted, as the foundation of the American system of government, and incorporated into the whole frame-work of the Constitution, these two great facts of our history and condition; the separate existence and partial sovereignty of the several States, and the Union of the people of these States into one mighty nation, under one common government.

Like all the works of God, this arrangement of His Providence consists of apparently conflicting elements. The harmony of the universe is the mutual antagonism of opposing forces, rightly ordered. The harmony, the perpetuity and the power of American institutions depend upon the just antagonism of these two opposing forces; the separate sovereignty of the States, and the Union of the States under one government into one nation. The wisdom of our Fathers did not invent this wondrously complicated system. Nor could they have taken the first step towards the execution of such a plan. The whole design came from the wisdom and care of Him, who so ordered our national growth, that we were *at all times one people*, and likewise, *at all times under the direction of separate local governments*. The profound wisdom of our fathers was shown in their recognition of the wisdom and goodness of God in making this provision for the welfare and for the liberties of His people; and in the care which they took to maintain and perpetuate it in the whole frame-work of the government.

Of all the checks and balances in the written Constitution, this is the only one that survives with any living and effective power. This not only lives, but it is as vital and efficient as ever. The reason is, that this provision is not only a part of the written Constitution, but it lives in the hearts of the people,



and in the whole practical working of American society. The fact is another pregnant illustration of the principle that real governments cannot be manufactured, but must be a growth out of the condition, circumstances, history, and character of a people. God, in His wise Providence, so ordered our growth as to give us this system. He gave it, not as an abstract principle, but as a living fact of our national existence. The framers of the Constitution found it a reality, and fixed it in that instrument, as the foundation of the whole fabric. It is this great and unprecedented feature of our institutions which saves this government from becoming a simple despotism, as crushing and oppressive as the worst tyrannies that have made the earth to groan. In the preservation of this system is garnered up the last hope of mankind for liberty and happiness. To attempt its destruction, to annihilate the Sovereignty of the States, or to dissolve the Union of the States, is TREASON, not only against the actual government, but treason against American liberty, treason against social order, treason against the highest hopes and aspirations of humanity, treason against the God of heaven who committed to us this inestimable trust for ourselves, and for the world.

The little creatures, the spawn of a long period of tranquil prosperity, who are continually prating, in the North, and in the South, about a dissolution of the Union, at each passage of the government which vexes into a miniature storm the undisciplined passions of their tiny souls, simply do not know what they are talking about. The people in the majesty of a virtuous indignation should send these mischievous, overgrown children home, and set them to work at something they can understand.

The very principle of our complex government is founded upon the postulate, that there may be at any time attempted wrong, and impending injury, from one side or the other. But the conservative remedy is, that the nation in its aggregate capacity, and each State as a separate commonwealth, possesses, in independent integrity, all the powers and functions of a self-sustaining government. The result is that either party is at once and effectually checked and restrained when it goes beyond its sphere, and undertakes to *execute* its purpose of oppression and wrong. The experience of the country so far has proved, and as long as we are capable of liberty the same thing will be true, that neither party can successfully oppress and injure the other. The action of each government in its own sphere is too constant, too regular, and too decisive, to be successfully overborne by the irregular and usurped action of the other in the same sphere.



But a dissolution of the Union would be the destruction forever of this only conservative element in our political system; and each of the parts would then be abandoned to that simple government, which, in any possible form, must be a despotism, intolerable, and destructive of all human right, liberty, and nobleness. The lightning flash may at last strike and shiver into many pieces the noble oak which has grown and hardened and battled against the fierce elements for a thousand years. You may find, and even gather up these charred and blackened atoms. But the pride of the forest is no more. The dissevered fragments have no vitality, or beauty, or self-sustaining power. So will it be when the anger of Heaven, for the sins of the people, shall rend asunder this glorious Union, which is no fabricated expedient, but a Divinely ordered growth, meeting all the exigencies of our position, and laden with the rich fruit of unnumbered blessings to us and to mankind.

But no constitution, no form of free government, however perfect, can stand, or be administered, unless by a people worthy of such a blessing and capable of such a trust. There must be a principle of stability and healthfulness in the whole social body, as well as in the construction and framework of the government. The Federal and State governments are alike worked by the people. And the people may at any time, when sufficiently maddened, sweep away this as well as every other barrier to their own self-will.

There is but one element of stability in the constitution of American society which can afford adequate security against incessant change, and the frequent upturning of all the foundations of civil society. That element is the Christian Religion. It is only Christianity that can teach men to look above themselves for a law, which is controlling and paramount; for a Will, to which the caprices of opinion and the impulses of passion must be alike submissive. Religion is the only common, unchanging, and unchangeable principle, which pervades the whole community, comes home to every bosom, and appeals with equal force to the high and to the low, to the intelligent and to the ignorant.

When we speak of religion as the only foundation of social order we, of course, do not refer to those modern notions of Christian religion which consider it as like all *human* science, an improvable thing, to change with the changing aspects of the human mind, and to assume to-day whatever form the whim or the conceit of a local or party majority may dictate. Much less do we refer to that undefinable system which makes Christianity to be the ten thousand various and conflicting opinions



which the diversified fancies of men may conjure out of the Christian revelation. These constitute no stay, no resting place, for the human mind; these present no basis for the truth, and no barrier against the lawless spirit of change and revolution. But we do mean that religion which has been always one; knowing no change but increasing fullness and clearness of manifestation—each successive development the immediate work and direct revelation of Him in whom alone are hid the treasures of knowledge and wisdom; and the whole system resting upon the immutable will of that same Being who knows no variableness nor shadow of turning. It is in this glorious system, which teaches us, that here the rude assaults of human pride and self-sufficiency must be staid; that upon this hallowed ground the reckless spirit of innovation dares not enter; it is in this system, that we must look for an enduring and efficient element of stability to operate upon the American mind. Here only can we find it. On this great rallying point the friends of permanence and of order must fall back. All else is change, disorder, confusion, and revolution; the utter subversion of ancient order, and the contemptuous disregard of old customs, hallowed principles, and venerable institutions. Abandon this ground, and the most sacred and best established principles are forced to give way to every superficial sophism and crude conceit which for the time may find favor with the democratic sovereign, or with his self-constituted prompters.



## ART. II.—THEODORE PARKER AND THE NEWEST THEOLOGY.

1. *A Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion.* By THEODORE PARKER. Fourth Edition. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. 1856. 12mo. pp. 466.
2. *Sermons of Theism, Atheism, and the Popular Theology.* By THEODORE PARKER, Minister of the twenty-eighth Congregational Society in Boston. 1856. Second edition. 12mo. pp. 365. Same publishers.
3. *Ten Sermons of Religion.* By THEODORE PARKER, Minister, &c. Second edition. Same publishers. 1855. 12mo. pp. 393.
4. *Two Sermons on Revivals*—"a False and True Revival of Religion" and "the Revival of Religion which we need"—April 4th and 11th, 1858.

THE name of Theodore Parker has become conspicuous among the events of the age, and is not unlikely to be so on the page of its history. As yet but a young man, comparatively, scarcely in the prime of life, he has become one of the most voluminous authors of our country; preaches to a congregation as large, we presume, as that of any other popular orator, not even Henry Ward Beecher excepted; is sought on public occasions, College Commencements, &c., as a public lecturer; his books reaching four and five editions in a rapid sale, and, as we learn from the papers, are coming to be recognized as Scripture with a sect by no means inconsiderable for its numbers.\*

---

\* At the late meeting of "Spiritualists" at Rutland, Vt., a leading member opened the exercises by reading "*A portion of divine truth, according to Theodore Parker.*" The volumes named at the head of this Article contain a fly leaf announcing the following volumes by Mr. Parker—besides which, and as later productions, we have seen several on Revival of Religion, &c., &c.

*A Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion.* 1 vol. 12mo. An Introduction to the Old Testament. From the German of De Wette, 2d ed., 2 vols. 8vo. Critical and Miscellaneous Writings. 1 vol. 12mo. Massachusetts Quarterly Review, 1848-50. 3 vols. 8vo. In Numbers. Occasional Sermons and Speeches. 2 vols. 12mo. Ten Sermons of Religion. 1 vol. 12mo. Sermons of Theism, Atheism, and the Popular Theology. 1 vol. 12mo. Additional Sermons and Speeches. 2 vols. 12mo. The Trial of Theodore Parker for the "Misdemeanor" of a Speech in Faneuil Hall against Kidnapping, with the Defense. 1855. 1 vol. 8vo.

*Pamphlets.*—A Sermon of Old Age. (1854.) The Dangers which Threaten the Rights of Man in America. (1854.) The Moral Dangers Incident to Prosperity. (1855.) Consequences of an Immoral Principle. (1855.) Function of a Minister. (1855.)



Such a phenomenon requires to be accounted for. We naturally desire to know what causes have produced it? What is its character? What are the effects it is likely to produce in its turn upon the popular mind and the course of events and of thoughts in the future? We know of no man, and of no works in modern times, pretending to discuss grave theological subjects, and in a grave and scientific way, that attract so many hearers and find so many readers. Do they appreciate the discussions? Do they adopt the preacher's doctrines; and gather around him from an appreciation of this new theology? and thus indicate the direction in which philosophic and theological speculations are tending—a prophecy of the future? Undoubtedly the phenomena have a meaning—a meaning which it is well for us to study and comprehend—if we may.

A man is always the resultant of several forces. First and inwardly, there is always something in the man himself—some constitution of nature whereby all external forces and influences are modified in their results so that he—the result—is never, as in mere physical motion, the measure of the amount, and a sure indication of the direction of the forces that have been exerted upon him. Then, outwardly every man that lives and grows up in society at all, is modified by and to some extent the product of certain external influences which may be distributed into several groups—as social, political, theological and philosophic and educational—meaning by this last, that influence of much or little advantage of teachers and study, irrespective of what may have come from what he studied. Without some knowledge of all these elements that go to make up the complex result—which is the man, as he stands before us in society and in history—we can never fully know what he is, or understand his position and bearing upon things around him; or to carry out our illustration a little farther, we cannot estimate him as a force that operates in the production of the future of the individual men by whom he is especially surrounded, or of society of which he is an integral and constituent part—of that future to which he contributes.

We do not propose to examine Mr. Parker in all these respects. For our purpose three only are all that we need to consider. He comes before us as a teacher of theology chiefly, but of a theology, derived, as he claims, not from the past, not from the creeds and formularies of his ancestry, not even from the Holy Scriptures, but solely from the Absolute Fountain, but really from himself, (though he scarcely admits so much,) by the means of philosophy. A philosophy he has, as all men have who think at all, whether consciously adopted, or unconsciously implied in every act of thought, in the investiga-



tion and verification of every doctrine which they utter. Coming also as a teacher of theology, it is impossible that the theologic influences that surrounded his early years have not exerted, whether by attraction or repulsion we need not now say, a large amount of influence upon him and upon his present opinions. If, now, we take account of himself as an individual personality, with endowments and a mental constitution of his own, and peculiar to himself, and then look at him as a product of theology and philosophy, we shall be in the way to comprehend the man and his influence; and if we fail to do so, the fault must be in ourselves, and not in the method or the means. Nay, we could not well go farther if we would, and however necessary it might become under other circumstances to do so. The political influences under which he has been produced are, indeed, a part of the history of our country, and, therefore, fairly at our command. But Mr. Parker is not before us as a private individual. The social and educational influences under which he was produced, we do not know, or, at least, have no right to investigate or bring before the world. Whether born and educated in affluence, with all that wealth can do for him; whether educated in schools and colleges with all the resources that they can command and all the conservative influences that they usually exert, does not appear by direct statement in any of the volumes before us. Nor is it material that we should know. We should hardly deem it possible, however, that he was nursed in the lap of luxury and self-indulgence. He has too much sturdy rough energy for that, and too little regard for the proprieties and respectabilities of life to have come from such a stock. Nor should we suppose that he had the patient care of a cautious training, in lopping off redundancies, weeding out the exuberant luxuriance of ornament in style, and ever urging and forcing the mind on to greater accuracy of expression, and sharper views of distinctions and definitions constantly tripping him up in those long leaps in the dark, under the canopy of high-sounding and long-drawn sentences indeed, but in which lurk all sorts of fallacies, non-sequiturs and metabases. We should rather suppose him to be one of those "encyclopedic heads, which dines on the science of mankind, and still wanders, crying for lack of meat," and, like all gormandizers, digests but imperfectly, throwing off as excrement what should have been assimilated, and sometimes, though not so often, or to so great an extent, assimilating what should have been thrown off, and in either case produces disease and an abnormal state of the vital functions.



But let us look at Mr. Parker as the result before we consider the forces that have produced him. Of him, and as a private individual and citizen, we propose to say nothing, except for sweet charity's sake to say, that we believe him to be a more humane, humble minded, and generous hearted man than his books would lead us to expect. Of boldness—daring, defiant boldness, that delights in attacking whatever is thought to be sacred and fearful—a boldness that amounts even to a love of boldness, for the consternation it produces in the beholders, we see abundant proof in the works before us. Of humility and self-distrust, we see nothing—absolutely nothing. So, too, the eloquent, reiterated and amplified, not to say impassioned commendations of the noblest sentiments, in his Sermons on Religion, as indeed, everywhere, raise a suspicion that the man is commending what he feels the need of—and his whole philosophy of life—we do not say his designed and intentional exhortations and advice, but his philosophy of life, is just such as is admirably calculated to produce a heartless indifference, and to quiet one's conscience in the enjoyment of such things as one can get for himself, leaving others to their penury and hardships, as the very thing which “the Father and Mother of all” has allotted for them in the exercise of “a perfect benevolence, adapting perfect means to a perfect end,” so that even to ameliorate their condition might be interfering with the divine plan. Such, we say, is the view to which his philosophy of life inevitably leads—although, as we have said, we believe from what we know of Mr. Parker, aside from these his published discourses, that he is one of the most kind-hearted and benevolent of men, with a generosity that amounts to heroism. Well! Locke was not a materialist, nor an atheist, though the philosophy he taught has made scores and hundreds of them. Des Cartes was himself as far from pantheism as any man need be, but his philosophy has developed a whole school of pantheists and given a pantheistic tendency to nearly all modern speculations, except those which have taken the opposite direction from the sensationalism of Bacon and Locke.

We suppose that in speaking of Mr. Parker as a theological reformer, we shall be ascribing to him only the character which he claims. In fact, every man who *thinks* and is not merely a receptacle and repeater—the mere aqueduct of other men's thoughts—is a reformer to the extent of the thought that he has. It modifies the wisdom of the world just as every particle of sand wafted down the Mississippi changes the configuration of the earth's surface to the extent of its bulk and the distance to which it has been removed. But Mr. Parker, if



his obvious, and, we may say, avowed design, does not fail, will not prove a mere sand particle, but rather a sand bar—a projecting rock that is to turn the whole current of the river in another direction, and stand forever as one of the way marks in the history of thought and theologic speculation. As such, and a reformer, whether great or small, he has of necessity two parts in him—the one destructive, denial, removing the old to prepare a place and way for the new, and the other constructive, positive, affirmative, erecting a structure in the place of that which he would remove. Now, as we shall have occasion to speak often of both of these parts, and frequently of the one, saying of it what could by no means be affirmed of the other, it will be well in this place, and before we proceed any further, to note the distinction and to call all our readers to take note also, that we shall call the latter part—the positive, constructive part—Mr. Parker's *doctrines*; and the former or destructive part, his *denials*—although they may sometimes be put into the form of what logicians would call affirmative propositions.

In order to get at a satisfactory statement of Parker's doctrines, we must begin with a view of his denials—see what he would clear away before he begins to build. And, as that which lies between doctrine and denial is partly both, without being wholly either, a sort of sub-soil or underground to his foundation-doctrine, we have his view of religion and theology in general. In this he denies that either are of divine origin, in the sense in which they are universally held to be so; he denies that they have been given by any special Revelation, so as to be in any sense obligatory upon the mind and conscience of man. But he affirms that they are, like all sciences, of human origin, arising in the thoughts of one man; improved, amended, and increased by the thoughts of the next, and so on, to the end of time. Among these men and the same in kind, however different in degree, he recognizes not only Moses, Isaiah, our Blessed Lord and His Apostles, but also Confucius and Menu, Zoroaster and Socrates, Mahomed and Swedenborg, Shem Zook, Joe Smith and the Mormons, with Andrew Jackson Davis and the Spiritualists, each and all as contributors to that science in which he appears and claims to be a collaborator, receiving from each and all, but not *as theirs*, or because they have taught it, whatever of their teachings commends itself to his sense of truth, (we suppose we ought to say, *the True*.) He claims that theology is progressive, like all other sciences.

Now this, which is the last in the order of time of his denials,



is also the first in the order of his doctrines. It is also the last attainment and result of what he calls "*criticism*," and the beginning of what is his philosophy, regarding both criticism and philosophy for the present as only methods and means to the grand result of the whole process.

In order to arrive at this result, he must, by way of criticism, show that neither the Bible nor its writers are what we have been accustomed to regard them, and what we have supposed that they claim to be. Now Mr. Parker claims that Criticism has shown that many of the Books held sacred as the channels of inspired thought, which have been regarded as genuine, are spurious, and among the rest the Gospel of St. John; those that have been regarded as authentic are full of mistakes, blunders, errors, and obscurities. We do not remember that he admits any one of them to be reliable as history, and of course he admits no one of them as authority in matters of doctrine.

"It is a notorious fact," says he, (*Discourses of Religion*, p. 307,) "that it has not been, and cannot be proved, . . . that any one book or word of the Bible was miraculously revealed to man." "Laying aside all prejudices, if we look into the Bible in a general way, as into other books, we find facts which force the conclusion upon us that the Bible is a human work, as much as the *Principia* of Newton, or *Descartes* or the *Vedas* and *Koran*. Some things are beautiful and true, but others, no man in his reason can accept. Here are works of various writers from the eleventh century before to the second century after Christ, thrown capriciously together and united by no common tie but the lids of the bookbinder. Here are two forms of Religion which differ widely, set forth and enforced by miracles; the one, ritual and formal; the other, actual and spiritual; the one the religion of Fear, the other of Love; one final and resting entirely on the special revelation made by Moses, the other progressive, based on the universal revelation of God, who enlightens all that come into the world; one offers only earthly recompense, the other makes immortality a motive to a divine life; one compels men, the other invites them. One half the Bible repeats the other half; the Gospel annihilates the two; the Apostles take the place of the Prophets and go higher up. If Christianity and Judaism be not the same thing, there must be hostility between the Old and the New Testament, for the Jewish form claims to be eternal. To unprejudiced men this hostility is very obvious. . . . If we look at the Bible as a whole, we find numerous contradictions, conflicting histories which no skill can reconcile with themselves or with facts; poems which the Christians have agreed to take as histories, but which lead only to confusion on that hypothesis; Prophecies that have never been fulfilled, and from the nature of things, never can be. We find stories of miracles which could not have happened; accounts which represent the laws of nature completely transformed as in fairy land—to trust the tales of the old romancers; stories that make God a man of war, cruel, capricious, revengeful, hateful, and not to be trusted. We find amatory songs, selfish proverbs, skeptical discourses, and the most awful imprecations human fancy ever clothed in speech. . . . Here are works whose authors are known; others of which the author, age and country are alike forgotten. Genuine and spurious works, religious and not religious, are strangely mixed, (p. 309.) Every book of the Old Testament bears distinct marks of its human origin; some of human folly and sin; all of human weakness and imperfection, (p. 311.) This general thesis may be affirmed. All the writings in the New Testament as well as the Old, contain marks of human origin, of human weakness and imperfection." (p. 333.)



This is sufficiently sweeping. If it be true, it has done enough by way of denial. It has removed all obstacles to any theory Mr. Parker may be disposed to establish in the place of what he calls "the popular theology."

We do not of course propose to examine this part of Mr. Parker's work. It opens, as will be seen, the whole question of the Evidences of Christianity, for which we have no time nor place here. But our readers may ask how it comes about that at this day and after so many centuries of inquiry and research, such results have been attained? how any one in view of all that has been said and believed in favor of Christianity and the Christian Scriptures, has come to announce such conclusions, with so much of confidence. One might indeed suspect from the very air of defiant boldness with which they are announced, that the author had even yet, though quite possibly he does not acknowledge it to himself in his own consciousness, some lingering doubts, some fears that after all he may be wrong. But he has none. It is Mr. Parker's nature to be thus confident. He is not a man of insight and of logic, but of the sensibility and the imagination. He is confident, as they always are who trust to their feelings, and not cautious and distrustful, as are they who are accustomed to look with a close scrutiny to their premises and their logic. We propose only two remarks in passing.

The first is, that these announcements as conclusions or results of "criticism," depend very much upon the opinions, prepossessions and prejudices with which one begins his investigations. Mr. Parker speaks of looking at the Bible impartially, and as an unprejudiced man. But the thing is impossible. Christianity is too near the heart for impartiality. If man be ruined by sin, redeemed by Christ, and doomed to eternal perdition, unless he surrenders himself to God and accepts that redemption; nay, if one looks at the Scriptures to see if such be the fact with regard to himself, he cannot do it with indifference. He will love if he believes, hate if he denies; and just as likely the reverse, believe if he loves, and because he loves; and reject the book and all that it contains if he hates the doctrines and conclusions which it presents for his consideration. Even in human affairs man is never indifferent to those who stand nearest to his heart, husband or wife, parent or child, brother or sister; we either love or hate them. To be indifferent to us, things must be further off, less nearly concerning our hearts and our happiness.

Now, suppose the state of the facts to remain the same and unchanged, and it will be true that a man may come to



precisely the same results as those which Mr. Parker has announced, or to those which are directly the opposites and contradictories of them, according as he goes to the investigation freighted with prejudices against, or presumptions in favor of the doctrines taught in the Scriptures; with a love for the conditions of salvation proposed, or a heart swelling with self-reliance and hostility to all restraint. Mr. Parker may doubt this; but men of soberer experience of human life, and a more penetrating insight into the subtle workings of the human heart than he seems to possess, will at once recognize and acknowledge its truth.\* Or, to put the matter in another shape, how happens it that he and a few others alone have come to this conclusion, when others who were old in study when he was a boy, as Andrews Norton, for example, men whom the world has never yet consented to call either fools or ignoramuses, not only have never come to such results, but have found in the investigation of these same facts, proofs, as they thought, that the books of the New Testament, the most of them at least, were both authentic and genuine? We refer to Mr. Norton, not because we consider him either the most learned or the most reliable of critics; but for a purpose which Mr. Parker cannot fail to understand. He was a man with no prejudices or prepossessions in favor of "the popular theology," which Mr. Parker handles so unceremoniously. He was a man *supposed* to have some accuracy, some patience of reflection, some indefatigability of research, some familiarity with all that remains of early monuments from which to prove either the genuineness and authenticity, or the spuriousness and untrustworthiness of the Sacred Scriptures. If he had stood alone in his conclusions in their favor, a little more modesty would have been becoming in the "Minister of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Church in Boston." But standing as he does in these respects with a host of others, not more learned or more highly gifted by nature than they, but laboring under no such burden of supposed prejudice in favor of "the popular theology," as they did, we think that a man not yet past the meridian of life,—hardly even has he reached it,—should have spoken a little more cautiously, as long ago as 1842. At that time, it could hardly have been the calmness of settled judgment, the confi-

---

\* Nay, Mr. Parker himself has said as much, and we quote Mr. Parker's words as best expressing our thought: "The results attained will depend on *the subjective peculiarities* [the italics are our own] of the inquirer, and so have the UNCERTAINTY of mere opinion, not the stability of historic knowledge." Discourse of Religion, p. 237.



dence of long settled and often reviewed opinions. It was rather the rashness of headlong impetuosity.

A part of the basis or ground of Mr. Parker's conclusions, as he intimates in the passages which we have quoted, is the absurdities and contradictions; contradictions to fact and to themselves which are contained in the Scriptures. But absurdities and contradictions are not matters of direct and obvious cognition. Their discovery is the result of a longer, more complicated and less certain intellectual process. An absurdity or contradiction may be adjudged to exist between two facts or statements, when the whole difficulty lies in *our misapprehension* of the facts, statements, or systems. When Mr. Parker speaks, therefore, of two forms of religion, the one contradictory to the other, we are compelled as cautious critics to pause and ask if it be not possible that even he has misconceived the meaning and purport of the old Dispensation, or the new; the ritual of the one in its relation to the spirituality of the other. Even Mr. Parker must allow that it is possible that such is the case; and many a reader of his works will feel quite sure that he may never have seen to the bottom and full import and meaning of what he rejects as senseless and absurd.

The second remark that we have to make, is with regard to Mr. Parker's capacity to comprehend and deal with *the facts* on which a judgment concerning the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures is to be based. Perhaps we can best accomplish this purpose for our readers by showing them by a quotation, (which will also subserve another purpose at the same time,) in which he gives us his conception of something with which we are already pretty familiar. Take the following, as a description of the *popular theology*, and compare it with what we have been taught and believe:

"According to the popular theology, there are three acknowledged persons in the Godhead.

"First, there is 'God the Father,' the Creator of the Universe and all that is therein; the great Being of the world, made to appear remarkable for three things: first, for great power to will and do; second, for great selfishness; and third, for great destructiveness. In the popular theology, God the Father is the grimmest object in the Universe; not loving and not lovely. In the New Testament, in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, [poor John is denied the authorship of his,] there are some dreadful qualities ascribed to God [and some good ones.]

"Then there is 'God the Son,' who is the Father in the flesh, with more humanity in him, and with very much less selfishness and destructiveness than is attributed to the Father. Still, in the popular theology the love which the Son bears towards man, is always limited. . . . It is no doctrine of the popular theology that Christ actually loves transgressors. [Mr. P. thinks it impious to deny that Judas is as dear to God as Jesus; the betrayer as the betrayed.]

"Then, thirdly, there is 'God the Holy Ghost,' the least important person in



the Trinity, who continually 'spreads undivided and operates unspent,' but does not spread far, or operate much, and is easily grieved away. The Holy Ghost is not represented as loving wicked men, that is, men who lack the conventional faith, or who are deficient in conventional righteousness.

"It is commonly said there are only three persons in the Deity. But there is really a fourth person, in the popular idea of God, in the Christian theology, to wit: the Devil, for the Devil is really the fourth person of the popular Godhead in the Christian churches, only he is not so named and confessed. . . .

"Then, God as a whole, is represented as angry with mankind as a whole. There is, on the one side, an offended God, and on the other, an offending human race. God the Father, is angry with mankind; God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, are both angry with mankind; and the Devil, 'the implacable enemy of the human race, as a roaring lion walks about seeking whom he may devour, especially unbelievers.'" *Sermons of Theism*, pp. 88-91.

It may be thought that Mr. Parker, in these words, did not represent the popular theology as he understood it; in other words, that he intentionally *misrepresented* and caricatured it. Possibly he did, although we hardly think that can have been the case. But we will give one passage more:

"If Jesus was but a wise and good man, no word of his could have authority over reason and conscience. At best, it could repeat their oracles, and therefore he could never found an institution which should be master of the soul."

Here, let it be carefully noted that he has assumed that the thing which historically and on "critical" grounds he is going to deny, is impossible in the nature of things; his philosophy has settled beforehand what can and what cannot be true; and previous to any appeal to fact to see whether it be so or not. But to our extract:

"But even if he were what the churches pretend, it does not appear that he has given this authority to any on earth. (1.) If we may credit the Gospels, Jesus established no organization, founded no church in any common sense of the term. (2.) He taught wherever men would listen; to numbers in the synagogue, temple, and fields; to a few in the little cottage at Bethany, and in the fisher's boat. He gave no instructions to his disciples to found a church. (3.) He sent them forth to preach the glad tidings to all mankind. The spirit within was their calling and authority, Jesus their example, God their guide, protector, and head. In all the ministrations of Jesus, there is nothing which approaches the formation of a church. (4.) What was freely received was to be given as freely. Baptism and the Supper were accidents. He appointed no particular body of men as teachers, (5,) but sent his disciples, all of them, to proclaim the truth. The twelve had no natural authority over the others, (6,) no preëminence in spreading the Gospel." (7.) —*Discourse of Religion*, p. 363.

We have placed figures in parenthesis against some of the statements in the above extract, which our readers will notice as directly contradictory to the plainest facts and declarations in the Gospels. It can be hardly necessary to cite the passages, for the sake of confronting Mr. Parker's fancies with



the facts of the record, his statements with the objects which he professes to represent in those statements. But we will cite a few. To the first, we oppose Luke xxii, 29-30. "And I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." To the (2.): Matt. xvi, 18. "On this rock I will build my church." Parker says he established no organization. But he instituted Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and appointed a Ministry with full authority, &c. Is not this to "establish an organization?" Parker admits the facts, but denies the inference. In the passage quoted, he says Baptism and the Supper were accidents. On p. 245, he says: "Did he [Christ] lay any stress on his watery dispensation, [Baptism,] count it valuable of itself? *Then we must drop a tear for the weakness.*"

So it seems not quite clear that our Lord did not regard Baptism as something more than a mere accident, but then it was a "weakness" of his. So much for the 3d and 4th. To the fifth, we refer to the well known cases in which our Lord is said to have ordained men [Mark iii, 14] that he might send them forth to preach. To the 6th, we cite in addition to the passage from Luke above given, Matt. xxviii, 18. "Whatever ye shall bind on earth," &c. John xx, 23, &c. "No preëminence in spreading the Gospel." To say that the twelve had no such preëminence in respect to St. Paul, is of course nothing to the purpose, though a striking declaration: for no body supposes they had. The designed effect of the declaration is to assert that there was no appointed or authorized Ministry.

But we are not going to argue these points with Mr. Parker. We cite them for the only and single purpose of enabling our readers to see and judge for themselves how far Mr. Parker is to be trusted in his attempts to deal with facts. He first judges of their possibility *a priori* by his own sense of what is possible and fit, and then finds them according to his own presentiment of what they ought to be. Nowhere does there seem to be any calm scrutiny of the facts of the case, no clear insight into their nature and import. And of course any inference which he may pretend to have drawn from the facts will depend for their value and accuracy upon the clearness and accuracy with which he apprehended the facts. And if the cases we have had before us are fair samples,—and we believe that they are,—we certainly have seen enough to satisfy ourselves that we need not be troubled by his conclusions, be they what they may; enough to relieve us from all surprise at



finding him differing so widely in his inferences from all others who had explored the same field before him. With such a facility at managing facts and authorities, it is very easy for him to prove anything that he may desire to prove; and it can make but little difference to us what he does claim to have proved; very little difference, we say, *to us*; and as for himself, he must settle that question with his own conscience and his God.

The next of Mr. Parker's denials which we will notice is contained in his view of the Author and Finisher of our Faith—the Blessed Jesus. From what has been said it must be evident that he denies both His divinity and His sacredness—the divinity of His person and the sacredness of His character. Nevertheless, Mr. Parker thinks well of the Son of Mary *as a man*, “the sublimest of all the sons of men, modest because he was great,”—“a man of genius for Religion”—“such a man!” “But it is vain to deny or attempt to conceal the errors in his doctrine.” “He was mistaken in some points of the greatest magnitude”—“profoundly in error with regard to them”—“the character of God—the existence of the Devil—the eternal damnation of men—the interpretation of the Old Testament.” He had “the weakness to suppose that the Sacraments as Baptism and the Eucharist could be anything more than accidents—in any way beneficial to the soul.” “Doubtless he had his errors, his follies, his faults and sins even; it is idle and absurd to deny it,” and on Calvary “he bears his own sins and not another’s.” We must deal tenderly with his faults, however. He was “the son of a peasant girl” of doubtful paternity; “His very birth” (as the Scriptures represent it) “a fling at marriage.” “Nazareth was no Athens where philosophy breathed in the circumambient air; it had neither Porch nor Lyceum—not even a school of the prophets.” And, moreover, “he died while quite young.” Nevertheless, he was “the greatest soul of all the sons of men,”—until (reverently be it spoken) Mr. Parker—we say until Mr. Parker, for it is a favorite maxim with him, and one that is often repeated, that “Spiritual men of the same elevation see always the same spiritual truth.” In view of this, we take it that one who could speak so confidently of the errors of that “greatest soul of all the sons of men,” “with a genius for Religion,” must be somewhat above Him. Nay, even that Nazarene was content with calling God His father. But our new teacher aspires to divinity on both sides. Wholly divine, God is his “Father and his Mother;” a divine parentage on both sides. Jesus was “the greatest soul of all the sons of men,” until Mr. Parker, (be it



reverently spoken,) and "modest because he was great." But our new divinity has no such impediment to his greatness; nothing limits or restrains the sweep of his genius. Facts yield before his ideas of what they ought to have been. Even the law of falling bodies in his hands becomes not the old and rather tame velocity of an increase in the ratio of the product of sixteen and a half into the successive odd numbers, 1, 3, 5, 7, &c., but at the rate of the square of the distance, for each successive moment. It was not "necessary for Jesus, any more than for other men, to understand all ancient Literature and be familiar with criticism and antiquities," but our new teacher has one of those "encyclopedic heads which dine on the science of mankind, and still wanders, crying for lack of meat."

Of course Mr. Parker does not believe in miracles or a special inspiration. The Scriptures are no sufficient testimony to the reality of miracles, because forsooth they are unworthy of credit. And they are unworthy of credit because, among other reasons, they testify to miracles and a special inspiration.

Now we are not going to blame Mr. Parker for making philosophy a test of Revelation. We do not intend to stultify ourselves or to cut the branch between ourselves and the tree. All men, however they may deny it and decry it, yet all men do make their philosophy a test and standard of Revelation, so far as to settle beforehand that some things are absolutely true—whether taught or denied by Revelation,—some absurd and impossible. We hold that two and two are four, and no book could make any progress towards gaining our acknowledgment which should teach otherwise. We hold that God is good—approves and rewards virtue—commends veracity and benevolence and purity, and no amount of testimony could convince us of the authenticity of a book that should teach otherwise, nor could we be persuaded that miracles had been wrought in confirmation of such doctrines. Mr. Parker's fault here is in carrying this matter too far, in making the latest hypothesis of a nebulous speculation a test of truth, with as much confidence as those fundamental axioms which none can doubt, and whose certainty is both absolute and intrinsic.

We beg our readers to be assured that we have not quoted the blasphemous sayings, given a page or two back, merely for the sake of shocking their sensibilities. We had no such unholy purpose in view. But it was right, we may add, necessary, that they should know the character we have to deal with—the results to which "the Absolute Religion," "the Philosophical Spiritualism," which Mr. Parker proposes to substitute for the Religion of Christ, may lead. But this is not



all. Nor should we regard even this as a sufficient justification for soiling our pages with such blasphemous expressions. We have another object in view. It is to present to Mr. Parker's consideration a view of the matter, the truth and importance of which is totally independent of the main issue between us—the question whether his doctrines are true in general or not. It is the fact that such expressions *are* blasphemous. And we have quoted but a small part of them, and that part perhaps not the worst that are to be found. The use of such expressions cannot be justified on any ground; nor if he has any but a diabolical purpose in view, can their use be in any way expedient or conducing to his main object.

We say the expressions are blasphemous. We know that the term is relative. Confining ourselves to the more literal and therefore the most general signification of the word, it is possible to blaspheme the Devil—that is, if there be any one, who has reverential regard for His Personage, and if there is not, it is not *his* fault. We freely admit also, that Mr. Parker does not regard the Character and Person of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, and the Sacraments, and worship of the Church, as entitled to reverential regard. Nay, he thinks that such reverence is a damage to mankind, one of the greatest hindrances to the welfare of man in our age. We are going to allow him the full benefit of all this, though, of course we differ from him in regard to it by “the distance of a whole equinox.” But we do not propose now to join issue on this point; we only demur to his inference from it, as a justification of his course in this matter. We are sure Mr. Parker will understand our point; we trust he will appreciate it.

We begin then, by saying that reverence is not only natural to the human soul, but that it is essential, indispensably necessary to virtue, to religion, to every healthy condition of existence. The soul that does not look up to, and reverence something superior to itself, is degraded and abandoned, so far as man or philosophy can see, beyond hope of recovery or elevation. Mr. Parker admits that even the Fetichism of savages is better than no religion, and no religious sensibility. But without reverence there can be no religion—no religious sensibility—not even for the dumb and senseless fetich, and from this, through all the grades up as Mr. Parker has described them, up through polytheism—the monotheism of Moses, the theism of the Christian Scriptures, up until one comes to the full idea of the Absolute God—“the Father and Mother of all,” as Mr. Parker would describe IT, (we say “*it*,” for we cannot speak of God as HIM any longer, in Mr. Parker's theology,) up we



say to the full idea of that which is "the Father and Mother of all," "both Matter and Spirit,"—there must be, in order that there may be any religion—any virtue or holiness growing out of the idea of God, and of faith in Him—reverence and awe—a reverential awe, that humbles and subdues the soul. It is true Mr. Parker says that in God, as he understands and conceives His character, "there is nothing to fear," (Sermons of Theism, p. 185,) yet reverence for Him there is and must be, or there is no worship, no religion, no elevation of soul, or of life coming from one's belief in God.

But in the next place we say that this reverence must be *transferred* if it terminates in a wrong object and not *exterminated*, and here is Mr. Parker's great fault. Admit that this reverence in the mass of the Christians at the present day is a mistaken reverence, paid to an unworthy or mistaken object. Yet, it is genuine, it is sincere—at least with all who are not hypocrites—with all whom it is worth Mr. Parker's while to consider at all. And ridicule of the object of this reverence, does not transfer it to a worthier or higher object—does not transfer it at all; it kills and destroys it. Its only tendency is to fill hearers with scoffing and irreverence. The man who wishes to seduce his neighbor's wife, does not begin by ridiculing and slandering her husband, whom she loves. He knows better than to take such a course. It would only shut her ears to his seducing flatteries, and make her cling closer to the man from whom he would seduce her. He must gain her heart to himself without shocking and outraging it, and only after she is completely won to the seducer and weaned from her true husband, may he venture to make sure his conquest, by words of disrespect and contumely concerning him whom she has loved, wronged, and forsaken. Such is the law of the sensibility, pertaining to all the benevolent affections. We cannot create one special manifestation by destroying another. We are far more likely to turn it into its opposites—into a general malevolence and misanthropy, and distrust. Suppose then, Mr. Parker's object to be legitimate—his end in view just and proper, his means are ruinous to the very end he has in view—ruinous to the best interests of humanity. Suppose we say it is desirable to rid men of their reverence for the Bible—their veneration for Christian worship—their faith in the popular theology and to transfer their reverential regard to "the Absolute Religion," the "Philosophic Spiritualism." Mr. Parker's means can only make them irreverent, scoffing, and unbelieving. In destroying or breaking down the specific form, he destroys the genus, the very germ and seminal principle of religion altogether.



er. Let him set forth his new theology with all his eloquence, present it in all its loveliness and attractions, enlist all the reverence and awe that he can for his misty abstractions, and when men and women come to love it more than the God of the Gospel—when they come to find that this “Philosophical Spiritualism” satisfies the wants of their hearts better than the doctrines of sin, a cross and a Saviour as presented in Christianity—when they come to prefer “the Absolute Religion,” to the loving kindness of God, who while we were enemies loved us, and while we were sinners, died for us—then, and not till then, will they forsake the old way, the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness, and embrace—Mr. Parker’s views. Then, and not until then, may he blaspheme the Holiest of things to his heart’s content, with no longer a danger of defeating his own end, no longer a fear of injuring those whom he has converted to his faith. But until then, for prudence’s sake, if not for righteousness’, let him forbear and abstain from such uncalled-for outrages upon that which is most holy in men, most fundamental to all of virtue, and all of moral worth there may be in the world. Mr. Parker’s philosophy should have taught him all this. He believes in a progressive development of men, “as in all things else so in Religion.” They began in his estimation, low down in the scale of intelligence. “He seems to have no thought except for the day; his motives are gathered only from his present wants; no more. He knows no past, cares for no future, has nothing within him which checks any instinctive desire,” and yet nobly endowed, “with not a limb too many, not a passion too much.” From this he rises up through many thousands of years through Fetichism, Polytheism to Monism. As fast as he outgrows one form, he loses faith in it, disbelieves it, casts it off, and leaves it behind him. When he does outgrow a system he can’t be made to retain it; before he has reached the level of one, however good and true he can’t be made to receive it. Such are Mr. Parker’s views. And in this view to disengage people from a system, while they believe in it, and before they have outgrown it, is not only cruelty to them, but great injustice, the deepest infidelity to the great law of progress. It snatches the crutch from the cripple before his limb is strong enough to bear him up.

Leaving then Mr. Parker’s *denials*, and coming to his *doctrines*, we find but a small matter to present. After separating the denials we do not find much left, nothing which either cannot be demonstrated to be false, or is not contained in, as forming a part of, the old systems, which he so vehemently repudi-



ates, and which may not be unfolded with as much fullness and force without a word of blasphemy—a word of disrespect to reverential forms and ceremonies, a word of heresy against established creeds—a word of dissent from the most approved doctrines of the Churches, as Mr. Parker himself could desire. In saying this we do not mean to confine ourselves or refer to the Calvinistic standards with which alone Mr. Parker seems to have had any familiarity. His constantly quoted trio, which for him represents the popular theology, is Edwards, Hopkins, and Emmons; names which require no word of ours to characterize them. The doctrines of universal love and equal justice in God, is common to our Formulas. We never denounce a man for declaring that “the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal”—and this covers all that is good and valuable in Parker’s theory of a universal inspiration. Even his theory of a universal salvation is as true with us as with him, and on the same condition—a condition which he believes will be fulfilled and complied with. We on philosophic grounds fear it will not, and on Scripture grounds believe it will not; the condition namely that all men will act up to, and obey the light with regard to their duties which may be given them. Without it, and in conscious and intentional rebellion against the known will of God, no one, not even Mr. Parker, supposes that a moral being will or can be made happy. He thinks he has reason for believing, that all intelligent beings will come to such a willing submission to the will of God. We wish we could see reason to hope for such a result, but we are as confident we see reason to believe that many never will come to any such blissful issue of their being, as he is of the contrary. But the fault is their own, their chosen, voluntary, inexcusable fault.

Mr. Parker seems to think that great good would come to men from getting rid of any sense of obligation to Christ. Forgiveness is a mercy that does not belong to his theology, not even to his hopes. He expects and wishes to suffer for every fault and transgression of his, if not in this world, yet in the next, and he had a little rather it would be in the next. “Each man must be his own Christ, or he is no Christian.” (Discourse of Religion, p. 434.) “Jesus of Nazareth bears his own sins, not another’s.” (Ibid, 427.) Now, admit for the sake of the argument, that we are under no obligation to Christ, that the sense of obligation and of gratitude were without foundation; yet, looking at it ethically, from a moral point of view alone, and nothing is more certain than that the



sense of obligation and gratitude for favors received does not belittle the soul, does in no way endamage its virtue, either in quantity or quality; especially if the gratitude be towards a generous, unselfish benefactor, who expects no benefits in return for his disinterestedness. On the contrary, gratitude is a most healthy psychological "diathesis." Nothing more favors and promotes the most delicate and the rarest of all virtues. A sense of obligation and of gratitude to Christ, can do no harm, then, even if there be no good foundation for it in fact. It certainly is not bestowing upon Him what is or can be due to any other, unless that other be ourselves; and if it is, the bestowal can do *us* no harm. It may take away a little of our boldness, make some abatement to our self-complacency; and that will do no harm to the most of us.

In like manner, Mr. Parker thinks that men ought to be freed as speedily as possible from all fear of God, and of an eternal Hell. But suppose again, as before, that these fears are groundless. Mr. Parker would have men do right. Does this fear prevent them from doing so? Did man, woman or child, did even Mr. Parker himself, ever fear God, or Hell, when he was conscious of having done what was right, and only that? The thing is impossible. There is no fear except the fear of man, in doing right, in keeping one's conscience undefiled. Whatever force or influence, therefore, there may be in the fear of God and of Hell, must be in the direction of what Mr. Parker would have men pursue as their souls' health and welfare. We cannot see how they would pursue it more earnestly, or with a purer zeal, if that fear were abated. It is indeed true that Christianity and "the popular theology" allow certain things, and quite possibly compel another, which Mr. Parker thinks they ought not. They allow of slavery, but they do not compel it. No man, not even the most bigoted devotee of "the popular theology," ever thought that Christianity *required* him to be a slaveholder, or felt a single emotion of "fear," either of God or of Hell, because he was not a slaveholder. We have alluded to the possibility of Christianity's compelling what Mr. Parker thinks ought not to be compulsory. But we are not quite sure what he does mean, on this point, from that portion of his publications which we have seen. We refer to the doctrine of marriage, and the compelling a man to be faithful to the one wife he may have taken, even though his fancy may have run off to another woman. But of this, we do not design to speak, for our author has not, in the works under notice, expressed



himself distinctly, and we might do him injustice.\* But granting that both the sense of gratitude for redemption and the fear of God, which a wise man of old thought was "the beginning of wisdom," and the belief in future punishment, are all unfounded, we cannot see on what grounds Mr. Parker can expect that their extinction would benefit mankind, how they hinder our virtue. Perhaps they do deepen our penitence, and Mr. Parker don't think very highly of that sentiment. "If a man thinks himself a miserable offender, let him away with the offense and be done with the complaint at once and forever. It is dangerous to reiterate so sad a cry." (*Sermons of Religion*, p. 20.) There are persons for whom that is easier said than done.

We have now done with the first part of our undertaking, namely, to show what Mr. Parker, *as a teacher*, is,—not as a man; what are his denials and his doctrines. We are not to suppose that the two thousand that gather to hear him of a Sunday, nor the many more thousands that buy his books, edition after edition, ever do so for the mere love of what he teaches, of such denials and doctrines as we have seen exhibited. Not at all. No statistics can ever show how large a proportion of them are already debauched in heart and mind, utterly lost to all reverence for what is holy, all fear of God, all belief in future punishment; who go merely for the gratification of these depraved sentiments, and to be assured that there is nothing to fear, though they can hardly believe it themselves. No man, we say, can tell, and no man has a right to judge how many of them would never go near him for aught of good there may be in his teachings, or to have their good resolutions strengthened, their consciences enlightened, or their hearts awakened to a juster sense of their destiny and their responsibility. But as human nature is, we know that a large part of the followers that such preaching and such teaching will attract, are of this kind. Others and persons of a less hopeless character, there doubtless are. Mr. Parker is a hopeful man himself. He holds out the brightest prospects. In his "Revival which we need," he describes the effect of religion as he teaches it, in this wise:

"The growth of economy, industry, riches; the power of chaste love, passion and affection, going hand in hand, taking sweet counsel together. The growth of

---

\* In his *Sermons on Theism*, p. 342, he speaks not only of "involuntary singleness—painful and against nature;" but also of "ill-assorted wedlock begun in haste, repented of at leisure, but made permanent by statute and public opinion."



justice, humanity, charity. Only think of it! Forts turned into pleasure grounds, all training fields converted into public gardens; ships of war the penny-posters of the deep; arsenals changed to museums; jails become hospitals; not a gallows in America; slavery all ended, black slavery, white slavery; no murder; no theft, prostitution gone; no beastial lust anywhere, but human love forever; poverty ended, drunkenness all banished; no staggering in the street, not an Irishman drunk, not even a member of Congress; no kidnapper between the seas; no liar in the chair of governor or broker."

Surely this is desirable, for a certain class at least, "no poverty," "no jails," not a gallows in all America, no "enforced celibacy, not more grateful to maid than to man, and meant for neither," and the bare promise of such things will gather a crowd around any man. It will gather all who have fear of jails, all who look with personal concern towards a possible gallows—all men whom poverty like a grim monster drags unwillingly to an unloved drudgery of daily toil, all the fading spinsters doomed to "a forced celibacy, not more grateful to maid than to man." Multitudes in their eagerness for the result will forget or neglect to ask how, and by what means, all this is to be brought about. And Mr. Parker has nowhere told us, except that it is to come, by every man, woman, and child's doing what is right. He has proposed no new motives or inducements to influence them in that direction. He has proposed to abolish some of those which have been hitherto relied upon. But he brings no new ones and even enfeebls, by generalizing, most of those that he would permit to remain. But he would have a glorious religion, a glorious state of society, as the result—a glorious state—if he could only get it—in which men and women too, are to enjoy to the fullest extent "every limb of the body—every faculty of the soul with every power acquired over man or matter,"—"passion and affection going hand in hand,"—"no poverty, no man or maid doomed to a forced celibacy ungrateful to either." If he can secure wealth and marriage with his "passional and affectional love," "going hand in hand," to all his hearers, he will not want for hearers in some generations to come, we fear; not a poor man in all the world, not even an old maid living in "involuntary singleness." Why! the millennium or something a thousand fold better is upon us. Ho, ye idlers, no more poverty, ye vagabonds, "no more jails, not a gallows in all America," not even a disconsolate spinster pining for a husband in "involuntary singleness, painful and against nature," but free marriage and free love for all and a plenty to live upon. None obliged to abide an ill assorted marriage, "more hateful than celibacy itself."

We are well aware that sarcasm and ridicule prove nothing,



except a revelation of the *animus* of him, who resorts to them. And if we have been tempted sometimes beyond the limits we had set to ourselves, we must offer in apology, the fact that never in our experience have we been so strongly tempted in that direction, and we readily acknowledge the incompatibility of such things, with the solemn and awful subjects with which we have had to deal; life, death; Eternity, Redemption; a dying Saviour, dying for lost men, and man dying and lost because he will not accept that Saviour; these are subjects too solemn for even the amount of levity implied in ridicule; too soul-subduing for even so much of bitterness as would be necessary for successful sarcasm.

But there is another, perhaps more important, view to be taken of this whole subject, viz: the Philosophical grounds of Mr. Parker's Theology, which we reserve for another Article.



ART. III.—PARTON'S AARON BURR, DISSECTED BY A  
NONAGENARIAN.\*

*The Life and Times of Aaron Burr, Lieutenant Colonel in the army of the Revolution, United States Senator, Vice President of the United States, &c.* By J. PARTON, author of "Humorous Poetry of the English Language," "Life of Horace Greeley," &c. New York: Mason Brothers. 1858. pp. 696.

THE object of the above mentioned work is undoubtedly a very bold one. It is nothing less than the reversal in the public mind of a judgment passed by it, with great unanimity, more than half a century since, upon the character of AARON BURR. A judgment sanctioned by an undisturbed acquiescence for such a length of time, should seem to render its reversal a hopeless undertaking in the conception of ordinary minds; and, indeed, of all, except those who seek notice and distinction by affecting to have made discoveries of facts which had escaped the observation of others; or to have the capacity of deducing, from known and acknowledged facts, conclusions which have been overlooked by the great mass of the community. A few instances there are of persons who have the ambition to make themselves conspicuous by their writings, even though they should fail to change public opinion in regard to the subject of their efforts. Some few writers of this class have recently appeared in England; one of whom has undertaken to relieve the character of Richard III, from the merited execration of centuries. Another, with much facility of diction, seeks to purge in the menstruum of the "Holy Roman Communion," the name of the first Mary of that kingdom from the epithet of "bloody." In the same spirit, if not in imitation of those writers, Mr. Parton has labored

---

\* Notwithstanding that a review of "Parton's Life of Aaron Burr," appeared in our April Number, the reader will be pleased to see the following *critique* upon the same work, worthless as that volume is in itself. It is written by a venerable gentleman now in the *ninetieth year of his age*, who has a high reputation as a scholar and a civilian; and whose familiarity with the leading men, and with the prominent events of our Revolutionary history, renders him eminently qualified to speak authoritatively of such a work as that now under examination. We have, also, in our possession, the same author's "PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF GENERAL WASHINGTON," which we shall hereafter publish over his own name.



through nearly 700 pages, with much industry, and considerable facility of style, to rescue from the deep grave of public execration the buried honors of AARON BURR, gory in the blood of the murdered HAMILTON.

With what success his efforts have been crowned, it is the object of this Article to examine. That the subject of his work, AARON BURR, was a man of extraordinary talent, both native and acquired, no person of sense will deny, or feel any disposition to question. His sire and grandsire, both of them highly eminent for their natural endowments, and for their acquirements in knowledge, as well as for the purity and excellence of their lives and actions, the son of the one and the grandson of the other, was probably in certain gifts fully their equal. All accounts assure us that Burr had an aptitude and a thirst for the acquirement of learning, rarely if ever surpassed by any youth of his years. Industrious habits he early formed, which lasted him through a long life. It is said he habituated himself to only four hours of sleep out of the twenty-four, and thereby lengthened his active life a fifth or a sixth beyond that of ordinary students or professional men. He was but a little over nineteen when the Revolutionary War broke out; and embarking immediately in it as a volunteer, of great promise, as he certainly was, he soon obtained a commission; and as advancements in the military ranks were at first very rapid, he received a field commission before he was twenty-one years old, and was in active service for four or five campaigns, when, on account of impaired health, he resigned. He no doubt was as efficient as his situation and grade of office would allow, for no one ever doubted his bravery, or his solicitude for an opportunity for its display; but he was by no means as serviceable as Mr. Parton has represented, as will hereafter be shown.

On resigning his commission in the Army, Col. Burr resumed the study of Law, which he had barely commenced when the War broke out, and pursued it now with his accustomed assiduity. Taking advantage of the lax state of the rules of admission to the Bar in the State of New York at that period, he gained admittance after a very short course of study. The Bar was, at that time, a promising field to a beginner of prompt talents and entire self-confidence, both of which Burr possessed in an eminent degree. By the Laws of the State, loyalists, or tories, were prohibited from practising in the Courts; and such were a large portion of the members of the Bar of the entire State, embracing some of the largest practitioners; while nearly all the eminent members of



the whig portion of the Bar were already immersed in politics, and thereby withdrawn from practice. Under these circumstances, Burr, being one of the first and most prominent of the newly admitted members, found himself almost immediately in the enjoyment of a large and lucrative practice, giving full scope to his precocious talents and requiring their exercise, and rose in a very brief time to the position to which he aspired, the head of his profession. While he devoted himself entirely to his professional duties, his practice was probably the most lucrative of any member of it. Nor had he any rival in the profession, in point of fame, except ALEXANDER HAMILTON, who was a year or two after Burr at the Bar; and whose attention at first being divided between Law and Politics, soon became wholly absorbed in the latter. Burr, therefore, for a number of years, had no equal in point of amount of business and of profits, until he began to indulge in the desire of political promotion, to which his profession was the readiest road. To this, unfortunately probably to himself, certainly to his country, he at length yielded. As a practitioner at the Bar, Col. Burr was much and deservedly celebrated for his indefatigable preparation of his cases, for his adroit management of them on trial, and for his forcible and efficient discussion of their merits, so that he soon gained the fame of a very successful advocate. But to assert, as Mr. Parton has in his volume, that, in the long course of his practice of at least thirty years, first and last, he never lost a case, is ridiculous beyond measure.

To dwell upon Col. Burr's political career, singularly efficient at first and for a series of years, and propitious to his aims and aspirations, but in the result so disastrous to himself and profitless to his country, would require a sketch of the entire period; and to speak of his private life, a continued scene of mystery and intrigue, we should need to follow him through his entire history. This is the chosen province of the author of the work before us, and to that we will now attend.

Mr. Parton commences by affecting to clear the ground of the rubbish of mistaken opinions formerly held as to the real character of the hero of his work. And in this category, he expressly includes the work of Matthew L. Davis, the literary legatee of Col. Burr, and to whom were confided all the papers which he chose to leave behind him; believing, no doubt, that time had carried with it to its silent abode all the cotemporaries of Burr in his earlier career, or, at least, all who had, at that period, arrived at observing and adult years. One, at least, however, survives, with a memory not so much impaired



as to receive fiction for fact. Of the qualifications of Mr. Parton to relate with historical accuracy, events to which his memory cannot reach, a few prominent instances of historical errors may be selected, out of the multitude with which his volume abounds.

In Chapter IV, entitled the "Education of Aaron Burr," his uncle and guardian, TIMOTHY EDWARDS, is stated to be a puritanical *clergyman*, and pastor of the Church in Newark, where Burr was born, and a successor, in that station, of his father, the Rev. A. Burr. Whereas, in point of fact, that uncle and guardian was a merchant, then residing in Newark, where he continued to reside until Burr was nearly through his College course, or till 1771, when he returned to his former residence in his father's life-time in Stockbridge, Mass. Mr. Edwards was much in public life, and was for many years Judge of Probate for Berkshire County, but never for a day in his entire life was he a clergyman. And such is the reckless indifference to facts in a work boasted of as written for the correction of erroneous notions, that, at p. 623, the author speaks of this same gentleman, as the "Hon. Timothy Edwards!"

Again, in speaking of the celebrated Doctor Bellamy, of whom, for a short time, Burr was a pupil, he states him (Dr. B.) to have studied divinity with Dr. Jonathan Edwards; whereas, in point of fact, Dr. Edwards never saw Dr. Bellamy until after the latter had become a distinguished preacher, who called upon Dr. Edwards and preached for him at Northampton; a very interesting account of which has been repeatedly published.

Again, in regard to other events not pertaining to the subject of his volume, on p. 171, Robert Livingston is spoken of as one of the framers of the Constitution of the United States; whereas the only delegates to that Convention from New York, were ROBERT YATES, ALEXANDER HAMILTON, and JOHN LANSING.

Again, in speaking of the events of the French Revolution, the flight of the King is said to have been in 1790; whereas it took place on the 21st of June, 1791.

These are a few specimens of the historical accuracy of a writer who announces his object to be to correct the errors of all former tradition and written statements in regard to the life of Aaron Burr! In the main body of his narrative, the misstatements are almost innumerable; and indeed much of it is mere fiction. But why, it may be asked, be at the pains of exposing these errors? Such a book, it may be said, can do



no harm. With people of information, this is indeed true; but these are a small minority of the entire population. The book is said to have had a large sale and a popular run, which was undoubtedly the prime inducement of its author in its preparation. But another object is apparent to the reader; and that is, the manifest desire of the writer to trick out, in an alluring garb, a character which is obviously one of his approval, if not of his admiration. Occasionally, indeed, a hint is thrown out as if to check or qualify somewhat the reader's approbation of the hero; but this affected candor only serves to make that approbation itself the more secure. Another specific object of the writer, is very apparent throughout the work. It is to make the character of AARON BURR appear more estimable, comparatively, than that of him who is styled his rival, ALEXANDER HAMILTON. Upon Hamilton's actions, when incidentally mentioned, the writer never fails to comment with unsparing severity, however justifiable and patriotic those actions were. And finally, on one of the last pages of his book, the author comes out with his express preference for the character of Burr. This much, however, he might have omitted, for there is nothing in the entire work which manifests the least approbation of Hamilton's character, nor regret at his untimely death; while of the character of Burr there is much of approbation and admiration.

That we may proceed more methodically with our criticism upon the work before us, we shall, in some measure, follow the writer in the order of his own narrative.

Chapter Fifth, entitled "The Volunteer," describes the assault upon Quebec, and the fall of Gen. Montgomery. This whole story is, with little exception, an entire fiction. So far as Burr's actions are professed to be given, the story now told is not warranted, nor even countenanced, by the reports at the time, nor by any writer, or traditionary account in existence, until more than half a century after that memorable disaster. Nor were the splendid achievements of Burr, as herein stated, ever heard of until some hired dunce, or mischievous lover of a hoax, published in a New York newspaper the story of Burr's bearing off Montgomery upon his shoulders; a thing which he could no more have done than he could have shouldered an elephant. The silly fable runs, that Burr not only shouldered Montgomery, but ran a very considerable distance with him upon his back, knee-deep in snow, while the victorious and pursuing enemy were within forty paces of him. He states, also, that at the first and only discharge of a cannon, all who were near Montgomery fell, together with their



leader, except Burr and his guide; and that no one yielded to Burr's appeal to go forward, though urged, as he says, "almost to the point of mutiny." And then it was, that Burr, with his usual coolness and sagacity, concludes to shoulder the dead body of the General, and to bear him through the deep snow to the camp, half a mile off, with a host of the enemy at his back; the Chaplain, his old College friend, being witness of the exploit.

The records of impudent folly cannot afford a parallel to this tale, couched in Mr. Parton's most elaborate effort at eloquence. The truth is, that Burr was neither at the side of Montgomery when slain, nor in the party under his immediate command; but in that commanded by Arnold, who conducted the attack at the other end of the lower town, and who succeeded in forcing his way into it; but having his leg shattered by a musket ball, was carried to the camp, and the command devolved upon Col. Morgan. He pushed further on, until the repulse of Montgomery's party enabled Carleton to bring the whole of his force against him, and overpower him by numbers, and cut off his retreat; and after a protracted and brave resistance, he was compelled to surrender with his whole party, of whom, Burr was one. Burr doubtless fought bravely while resistance was proper, for his courage was never questioned. Being a mere volunteer, an officer by favor,\* and a Captain in effect, though without a commission of any grade, Burr is not spoken of in any historical account of that disastrous event. The Officers were all immediately set at liberty by Gov. Carleton. But the fame of "little Burr's" achievements, overwhelming the country, filling all mouths, and electrifying Congress and General Washington, was never heard of, (the above mentioned hoax excepted,) until made public in *Anno Domini*, 1858, by J. PARTON, "Author of the Life of Horace Greeley," &c.! The "agonizing suspense" of his sister was not relieved by the published accounts of the brother's achievements, but by his personal presence at her own fireside in Litchfield, Conn., where he arrived in due and proper time from Quebec.

This statement in regard to the capture of Burr, and of his coming to Connecticut a prisoner on parol, cannot be verified by any printed authority, for none such could be expected; but must depend upon the veracity of the writer of this Article, who hereby asserts, that he received the account of the arrival of Burr at his house in Litchfield, from the mouth of Burr's brother-in-law, the Hon. TAPPING REEVE. The story of Burr's remaining in Arnold's camp throughout the winter,



of his being appointed by him as Brigade-Major; of his holding that Office until the American troops were driven from before Quebec by Gen. Burgoyne; of his separation from Arnold on the Sorel in a mutinous manner, such as must have subjected him to ruin and disgrace as an Officer, is an entire fabrication, from beginning to end. Not a word of it can be proved from any historical work. So far from it, authentic history proves that Arnold was superseded in the command by GEN. WOOSTER, and almost immediately after repaired to Montreal, and took the command there more than a month before the arrival of the first British reinforcements at Quebec, which was not until May 7th, 1776, when Gen. Thomas, then in command, immediately made a rapid retreat to the station on the Three Rivers; where, dying, he was succeeded by Gen. Sullivan. Arnold still remained at Montreal, and was never at the Sorel, the scene of the described separation from Burr, except to pass its mouth on his way, without troops, early in April, to his command at Montreal.\*

In treating of Col. Burr's military career, Mr. Parton next informs us of his residence in the family of Gen. Washington, for a short time, as one of his aids-de-camp; but that not being pleased with the situation, he declined further service in that capacity, and became the Aid of Gen. Putnam. The truth is, Burr never was an aid-de-camp of Washington. He resided a short time in the General's family, but soon betrayed such qualities of mind and heart, as prevented his receiving the appointment which he was ambitious of obtaining; and the failure of it was the cause of a deep-rooted enmity to that illustrious man, which he cherished during his whole life; always indulging in detractions from Washington's fame, both civil and military, and manifesting an opposition to his administration, enhanced in bitterness by his personal grudge in not being able to impose upon his discerning mind.

While an aid-de-camp to Gen. Putnam, Mr. Parton, by way of episode, more than from any necessary connection with his military career, repeats and examines the story that Burr accomplished the seduction of a very young lady, unfortunately at the time in the hands of the public enemies of her father; a highly respectable man, and of respectable connections; leading her thereby to a course of conduct which ended in rendering her character conspicuously infamous.

But to return to military exploits. Mr. Parton informs the

---

\* See Marshall's *Life of Washington*, and other historical accounts of the campaigns of 1775-6, in Canada.



public, that Col. Burr, on the day of the retreat of our army from New York, saved a brigade from certain capture or destruction by his own individual authority, wresting the command from GEN. KNOX, the Officer to whom it was entrusted, with strict directions to maintain this post at all hazards; and that Burr, on his own personal responsibility, led them all to a place of safety, with the exception of a few in the rear who were cut off by the inclosing force of the enemy. Now, in the first place, GEN. KNOX, who was commander of the Artillery, never commanded a Brigade of Infantry. And if he had been in command at the place stated, he was the last man to have yielded his post to a Junior Officer holding no commission, and pretending to no authority from a higher power so to do. Doubtless the public are indebted to Mr. Parton for this first intimation of this great achievement; for in addition to its never having been heard of before, Mr. Parton informs us that GEN. WASHINGTON makes no mention of it in any communication extant to Congress, nor did he make any in a General Order at the time; and he says, with like fidelity to the truth, that Col. Burr complained of the suppression as a great act of injustice to him, imputing it to GEN. WASHINGTON's dislike and enmity. And the friends of Col. Burr's fame have the like cause of complaint against all the historians of the Revolutionary War down to this day; since they have all failed to chronicle any of the signal military exploits of their favorite. Even the great foray of some two thousand British troops into Orange County, laying waste a considerable part of it, which was met, checked, and driven back by Col. Burr with a comparatively insignificant force, and the capture of the picket-guard by him, seems to have been passed over in silence by the historians of those times. So, also, Burr's achievements in the affair at East Haven, and New Haven, Conn., where he is represented as haranguing the students on the College-green, and leading them out against Gov. Tryon, all this is in like matter omitted by the historians. In truth, that whole narrative is a sheer fiction, from beginning to end, with scarce the semblance of truth in it; as is well known by tradition and even by the testimony of living witnesses. That Burr was a good disciplinarian and a brave soldier, we suppose was never questioned; but that he was the knight-errant and the military Samson that he is here represented, we believe was never imagined by any one save by Mr. J. Parton.

Col. Burr's political career not having commenced until some twelve years after the termination of his military life, and being much more within the compass of living memory,



Mr. Parton, in his description of it, has drawn much less on his imagination. The era of the formation of the present Constitution of the United States, and of the Federal Administration under it, opened a wide field for public discussion through the press, both of principles and of facts, affording a wholesome correctness of statement in regard to the latter. In the political field, Col. Burr was doubtless very efficient, and for a considerable length of time, no one was more successful. Possessing a genius for intrigue, unfettered by principle, borne up by talents of a high reputation acquired at the Bar, and which were now directed to one object, his own exaltation, he rose to the Senate of the United States as if *per saltem*, and then attained the Vice Presidency, the second Office in the gift of the nation. The duties of that Office, as presiding Officer of the United States Senate, he performed in a manner highly creditable to himself. But here his good fortune seems to have ended. The success of his intrigue in gaining an equal footing with Mr. Jefferson, in the number of votes given by the Electors of President and Vice President, and thereby throwing the election into the House of Representatives, although the very object of his ambitious hopes, was the ground-work and cause of his declining popularity, and extinguished his hopes of reaching the goal of his ambition in what seemed to him the most direct and promising way. The long struggle in the House of Representatives, though it does not appear that Burr countenanced it, excited a strong jealousy in the minds of his original partisans and supporters, and was the cause of his rapid decline in popularity with them. Had he fallen short a vote or two in the Electoral College, no room would have existed for such a jealousy; or, had he patiently awaited the voluntary retirement of Jefferson, it is highly probable he might have been the fortunate successor.

That struggle, however, having been the cause of an alteration in the Constitution, as to the mode of future elections to those two Offices, together with his loss of popularity, rendered his prospects desperate in the course first adopted, and induced him to seek elevation through another channel; to wit, as Governor of the State of New York. This post, in itself a highly honorable station, he regarded as quite as promising from which to aspire to the Presidency, as that of Vice President, after the Constitutional change just mentioned. In this plan he failed; and out of chagrin and from revenge against the supposed author of his disappointment, he resorted to a measure fatal to the life of his selected antagonist. Thwarted in his hopes of ever attaining any higher elevation than a



gallows in his own country, he now had recourse to a conspiracy; the object of which was the division of the Union, and, by the aid of a band of desperadoes, the invasion and dismemberment or conquest of a country at peace with the United States, and then constituting himself the despotic ruler of such seceding States and conquered regions of country. The conspiracy exploded before any overt act of the meditated treason was committed; and thus the peace of the nation remained unbroken, and Burr escaped the punishment which his crimes would have surely brought upon his head.

Col. Burr's influence, while in public life, was at all times exerted against the National Administration of Washington. During that of Adams, he held no place in the National Government, but was busily employed in legislative concerns in the State of New York. But he was head-manager of all machinations against the Federal Government, and of the plots which produced its overthrow. During the Administration of Jefferson, his political course was so equivocal as to excite the distrust of both parties, and to prevent either from having any relations with him, both believing him to be totally destitute of integrity.

The fatal duel with Hamilton was, in all probability, the original inducement with Burr for the desperate plan of the dismemberment of the Union, and the invasion of Mexico. Finding his last hopes of elevation in the United States extinguished in the blood of Hamilton, and his personal safety jeopardized, then it was, that his reckless and insatiable ambition entered upon this chimerical plan. The real object in view, he attempted to disguise under the garb of a great land speculation; but every step in the scheme disclosed what was in truth its real character. In consequence, his teeming prospects were now reduced to the hope of escaping an ignominious punishment, and of evading even a sterner fate by a skulking flight from a country, of which he recently aspired to be its Chief Magistrate!

This dark chapter in the life of Aaron Burr has been glossed over by his biographer as gently as the public records of the country, and its public sentiment, then and since, will allow. And yet, all those of us who were then living, and at years of discretion, must still hold in vivid recollection the shock in the public mind, which that event produced. The voice of party spirit was silenced. The licensed indulgence of its feelings were hushed. The astounding fact was by all conceded, that the second Officer of the Government of the United States had been guilty of deliberate Murder in malice prepense! and that



a man, second to no man then living among us, in talent and influence, was the victim of that Murder! All who remember the correspondence of the parties then published, will concur in the opinion then universally expressed, that Burr determined, from the outset, to bring this issue to a deadly conflict.

Even Mr. Parton, in effect, concedes this, (p. 344.) Indeed, wherever, in the volume, Burr is described, alluding to this event, it is always as justifying his conduct, and even vaunting over it. Thus, the celebrated Jeremy Bentham says, that Burr declared he "was sure of being able to kill him;" and, Bentham adds, "I thought it little better than a murder," (p. 521.) His whole conversation with Bentham shows that Burr affected to glory over a deed which made him an exile and an outlaw. And, in the latter part of that volume, Mr. Parton seems to take special satisfaction in recurring to Burr's free and boastful conversations upon the subject of the duel.

But, what far exceeds all the Author's other statements, is that delineated on p. 617; where Burr's visit to the scene of the duel is described, and his own minute account of the whole affair is given with triumphant and self-applauding exultation. This visit is stated to have taken place twenty-five years after the event, and consequently when Burr was more than seventy years old. Burr is represented to have displayed in his description of the affair all the fire and eloquence of his best days; and the biographer clothes the narrative in the best dress of his choicest style. This, we believe, is the first instance of an assassin's voluntarily visiting the scene of a deliberate murder, as that of Hamilton unquestionably was; and it stamps upon the character of Aaron Burr, if possible, a deeper infamy, than even the atrocious duel exulted in!

In giving an account of Col. Burr's "Exile," "Escape," &c., as the chapters of the biography are entitled, comprising a period of about five years, which were little else than a blank in his life, Mr. Parton is unrestrained, either by cotemporaneous or subsequent documents, and seems to have given full play to his imagination and love of fiction. Burr is represented as full of plans, great and small, all of which are described as having been ingeniously concerted; but in all, for some inconceivable cause, he is disappointed. He remains in England, where he first landed, until driven from it apparently without cause; he visits Sweden and Germany without apparent object; he gets into France with much difficulty, and out of it with much greater; being compelled, sorely against his will, to remain for a long time, and that, too, for no assignable reason. Going to



Europe with scanty means, he was speedily reduced to want. The account of his destitution is the almost constant subject of the biographer's commiseration. He is described, in a number of instances, as reduced to a single *sous*; and then, without any cause stated, as in the possession of abundant funds; and, in all instances, these sources of relief are represented as of an unaccountable, mysterious origin and character. The number of cherished and disappointed hopes are more numerous than can be found in any Novel in our language; the most enigmatical of plots, hitherto conceived of, are here excelled; and even the *Mysteries of Udolpho* does not permit their equal.

At length Burr arrives in America. After skulking for a considerable time, during which, it is probable, the sham trial and acquittal of the long pending indictment for murder, (not mentioned by Mr. Parton, but by the Newspapers at the time,) by procurement of friends took place. Soon after which, it probably was, that Burr opened an Office for the practice of Law, in a rather obscure place indicated by a little tin sign; and we are told that, within twelve days, next after, he received \$2,000 retainer fees, and for professional advice. Through a long series of more than twenty years' practice, we are informed he was invariably successful in every instance—he being too wise or too conscientious to engage for a client whose cause was not just, or which might not be proved to be so! And yet, it is conceded by Mr. Parton, that Burr's company was shunned by respectable people, and that no respectable lawyer would consent to be associated with him in any case. And, though living in habits of personal economy and exemplary temperance, he died in a state of entire destitution, the result of his boundless generosity to unfortunate applicants for charity, against whom he would never shut his hand; though he never experienced any difficulty in doing so to the demands of his honest creditors. And during his long and entire disconnection with public affairs of every kind, which followed his return from Europe, and which all have heretofore supposed to have been as real as it was apparent, the public are now informed by Mr. Parton, that Col. Burr was the primary and really efficient cause of the overthrow of the Virginia control in national affairs, and of the elevation of GENERAL JACKSON to the Presidential chair! !

The private character of Col. Burr is, in the work before us, described as not less extraordinary for its singular and mysterious aspects, than his public character. Endowed by nature with a handsome person, of engaging manners, with a cunning unrestrained by a single particle of principle, or of feeling which



did not minister to self-indulgence, self-gratification, and the pride of success, he became the greatest of favorites in female society, in which he took delight; and the greatest of deceivers. Within his strictly domestic relations, his conduct is represented to have been amiable, affectionate, and exemplary; but, outside of that narrow circle, he is described as mischievous, depraving, and depraved. The number of females inveigled by his arts into imprudent literary correspondence with him, seems to have been surprisingly great, not only from Mr. Parton's work, but that of a former and chosen biographer, M. L. Davis, to whom Burr confided all his papers containing an immense mass of letters and copies of letters, from and to ladies, with whom he carried on a secret correspondence. These, Col. Burr put into Mr. Davis' hands; who, having perused them, proposed to Burr to have them destroyed. But Burr refused, preferring, it seems, to have the trophies of his amours preserved during his life, and then to be disposed of at the discretion of his literary executor. And he, out of regard to the reputation of Col. Burr, burnt them of course. Yet, Mr. Parton asserts that the destruction was not complete; for that many of them were known long after to have been in existence, to the danger of living victims of his seductive arts. What became of these letters, or what their contents were, does not appear; and yet, from the nature and object of Mr. Parton's work, it is quite certain that information of this sort, if known, would not have been withheld. In fine, Col. Burr himself "affected to be an extraordinary man, and an extraordinary man he most certainly was;" extraordinary for his talents, and quite as extraordinary for his vices, both public and private.

In respect to the work before us, considered as a biography, it may be said of it, that it is conceived and executed in a manner well calculated for effect upon young, unlearned, and sensitive readers; and with them, it is sure to have a mischievous influence. But, with those who lived in the days in which the events transpired of which it purports to treat, and with all other sensible and well-informed readers, it will be held in disgust, for its disregard to truth, its utter destitution of moral taste and principle, its ignorance of the times and events which it pretends to delineate, for its attempt to rescue the character of Aaron Burr from merited reproach and detestation; and for its instituted comparison between the characters of Burr and Hamilton, advantageous to the former and calumnious to the latter, whose principles and actions were as noble, disinterested, patriotic, and useful to his country, as those of Burr were mean, selfish, unpatriotic, and mischievous. The work,



in the estimation of the better class of readers, betrays an utter want of consistency, of any decent regard even, to the appearance of truth.

His self-contradictions are gross, numerous, and palpable, without the least attempt to excuse or palliate them. Such, for instance, as his assertion in divers places, that Burr was unskilled in the use of the pistol; and in other places that he was a fatal and deadly shot; and in his declaration that he knew he could kill Hamilton, and in the instances given of his being able to hit, and actually hitting, a small mark at much greater than duelling distance. Such, also, is Burr's alleged low estimate of the mental capacity of women, and the subsequent statement that he held their taste and capacity in high estimation, &c., &c. So, also, Mr. Parton, in his account of the second marriage of Aaron Burr, states that it took place when Burr was seventy-eight years old. He then describes a number of years of agreement and disagreement; of cohabiting, and of living separately; of seasons of love, and of aversion; there is a petition for divorce by the wife for alleged infidelity of the husband, he being on the verge of eighty years, and his vigorous denial of the facts alleged, and his afterwards abandoning the defense, and admitting the truth of the allegation by a default; the cause is then supposed to lie in Court a long time, yet no decree of divorce is granted, and no cause assigned, though opposition had ceased; the wife afterwards takes him home, and nurses him kindly many months, and afterwards suffers him in an entirely helpless condition to lie, and die, in a state of dependence upon the charity of others. All this interval of time cannot, upon any reasonable computation, have been less than, at least, four or five years; and yet, it is stated that he died at the age of eighty years, seven months, and eight days.

It is also stated, that at the time of Burr's death there was a suit commenced in chancery which, had he lived to bring it to a conclusion, could not have failed to be a successful one, and would have furnished a competent support to his *daughter*, eight years old at the time of his death. Who this daughter was, or where she came from, nowhere appears; nor is she elsewhere mentioned. Mrs. Alston, whose death Col. Burr so deeply deplored, is everywhere stated to be his only legitimate child. The daughter in question could not have been the issue of the second marriage; for that took place much less than eight years before his death; and, if an illegitimate child, she could not succeed to any property which he had at that time, or which might accrue to his heirs as such afterwards, unless by virtue of being constituted an heir by will in her favor; of



which there is no pretense. This is such a recklessly impudent falsehood as almost seems conspicuous among the long array of its fellows.

Such are some, but by no means all, of the bold falsehoods, the palpable inconsistencies, and self-contradictions, with which a work abounds, ushered into public notice with confident and supercilious claims of such superior means of knowledge in the author as has enabled him to correct the errors, not only of former writers, but public opinion in regard to his hero. The true character of Aaron Burr cannot be given in a condensed form. It must be gathered from a review of his whole conduct, both public and private, through the long course of a much varied life, a life not wholly destitute of merit, but disclosing, for the most part, the prostitution of uncommon abilities to unworthy purposes. Brilliant talents, he certainly possessed; but he had no claim to the character of a great man; for he was totally destitute of the prime ingredient of true greatness, *integrity*, guided by a sound, discriminating, and comprehensive judgment.\*

---

\* DYING HOURS OF AARON BURR.—A late *New York Observer* contains extracts from a letter from a relative of the Burr family and of Ogden E. Edwards, who was Burr's last friend, giving some facts as to the death of Burr, which have never before been published. The letter states, "My ———, Ogden E. Edwards, who died in 1848, felt a grateful interest in Col. Burr, from the fact of his having, in his prosperous days, aided my grandfather, Timothy Edwards, in pecuniary difficulties. He admired also the mind which God had given him, which, in all his degradation, shone forth in the most brilliant and fascinating narrations. He spent a week at my father's after he was seventy, and my impression of him, and of all he said and did, is very vivid. He was a hater of all mankind, a trifler with all womankind, and violated all the rights of hospitality in the license of his behavior. Parton's book is a tissue of lies, as far as family matters are related, and oh! how evil in its influence upon young men! My father used to say that Burr's killing Hamilton was the least of his crimes.

"Mr. Edwards found that Burr was continually annoyed when he lived in Nassau street by a set of miserable beings who pretended to have claims upon his charity. One morning there were eighteen or twenty, each telling the story of his or her wrongs. The larger part were women. He snatched a shilling from under his pillow and threw it among them, saying with one of his withering looks, 'There, ye harpies, take the last cent I have.' Mr. E. then removed him to Richmond, Staten Island; employed a faithful Irish nurse to attend him, and went down every day to see him. One day, as he approached the hotel, the nurse met him near the door, saying, 'Indade, sir, he's very bad, he wants the priest.' Mr. E. sent her for the Dutch clergyman, and immediately entered Col. Burr's room. He found him struggling with death, and all he could understand was, 'Call the priest, call the priest.' The nurse soon returned with a Catholic priest, but he did not enter the room. My ——— added with a shudder, it was a fearful scene, and I never wish to speak of it again. My mother told me, three months before her death, that Ogden Edwards mentioned precisely the same circumstance to her.

"We would gladly that the grave should hide all the dark catalogue. But the life of Col. Burr is a study of no mean interest and importance, and is it not of fearful import that the shoal upon which so gifted a being was wrecked should be discovered?"



## ART. IV.—CHURCH UNIVERSITIES.

*Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of the University of the South, at their session held at Beersheba, Grundy County, Tennessee. Montgomery : 1858.*

THE subject of Education has been more prominently before the American mind, within the last few years, than at any former period. This result is due, perhaps, to our greater proximity to Europe; for our Continent has, during the past half century, been gradually drifting Eastward, until it now almost touches the shores of the Old World. Brought as we are into constant intercourse with the most polished nations of Europe, it is but natural that we should endeavor to imitate our neighbors in those qualities which have gained for them the homage of mankind, and a laudable ambition will induce us to study their institutions with a view to perfecting our own. While our former isolated position conferred great political advantages, it was not without its complementary evils in separating us from the world of Letters, and compelling us to fall back upon our own slender scholastic resources. Nor has our position as a new people in a new country, been more favorable to the interests of learning. A population much less than that of France, and scattered over an area of territory nearly equal to the whole of Europe, has been too busily engaged in felling primeval forests, building cities, and opening avenues of trade, to care much for the elegant scholarship of the old country; the ocean was between them, and prevented that ameliorating influence which a closer proximity would have occasioned. But, within a comparatively brief period, numbers of the better educated of our people, availing themselves of the increased facilities for travel, have visited England and the Continent, and brought back with them a just admiration of the learning of the Old World. The result has been a proper desire to emulate it; but, as if eager to atone for past remissness, and to wipe off the stigma of ignorance which attaches to us as a people, they are determined to effect at one effort, that which in Europe has been the work of a thousand years. Nor has this feeling been confined to one section of our country; it has occasioned simultaneous efforts in the North and the South, manifesting its presence in the former by an enlargement of the course of



study in the old Colleges, and an elevation of their requirements for admission, and in the latter by building up new Colleges, often endowed by the Legislatures of the respective States, the design being, in both sections, to reproduce in this country, a scholarship similar to that which sheds so dazzling a lustre on the European name.

Yet, desirable as this result must be acknowledged to be, it may fairly be questioned whether it is the proper method of accomplishing any object to begin at the wrong end. Were the presiding *genius* of Oxford, in a fit of spleen, to take up her Colleges, *dons*, libraries, and all, and set them down in the midst of our vast territory, it is doubtful whether that renowned University would not be embarrassed to sustain its reputation. But wherefore? Are not our countrymen susceptible of as high mental cultivation as the Europeans? Assuredly; but a great University in a land unprepared to receive it, would be a painfully unwieldy object, not understood, and but ill appreciated. It would resemble the follower of the Bourbon clad in the gigantic figure of Achilles:

"But thou——would'st soar a show  
Rather than hero;  
And yet, by being  
A little less removed from present men  
In figure, thou canst sway them more; for all  
Would rise against thee now, as if to hunt  
A new found mammoth."

The founders of our New England Colleges were not blind to this; or perhaps necessity compelled them to adopt a course which sagacity would have recommended, and which has proved favorable to the permanent growth of those institutions; they adapted the course of study to the quality of the preparatory training throughout the country, elevating it as much as possible, and leaving room for a gradual development of it. Those Colleges were, indeed, thus subjected to serious disadvantages; for while in their plan of operation they professed to be Universities, their standard of scholarship was ridiculously low. They were, in fact, neither High Schools nor Colleges, but mongrels of a debased breed. But the fault was not so much in the Colleges themselves, as in the system on which they were established. Unlike the Jesuit Colleges, which educate so well and are gaining so immense an influence among us, they relinquish the *preparatory training* of their pupils, a judicious step, had there been institutions capable of performing the work, as in Germany or England, but in the absence of such institutions an unfortunate one, as it deprived them of half



their power, and placed them at the mercy of the Grammar Schools, many of which were totally inadequate to the task. What educationist will not assert that the most important part of education consists in laying the foundation? And this most important duty the Colleges transferred to others. Constituted as they were, they labored under most serious disadvantages, for so long as applicants for admission found it difficult to comply with their slender requirements, it would have been mere folly to increase them; and as the time was limited, the student went forth at the end of his four years' course, bearing a Diploma which certified that he was "Baccalaureus in artibus liberalibus," but with a meagerness of classical attainment that would have excited the derision of an English school boy in the upper Fourth Form.

Having come to a sense of this lamentable deficiency, our people have been shamed into making some effort to supply it, and have looked wistfully over the broad Atlantic to those more favored seats where the cultivation of letters has for ages found a congenial home. It is not strange that their attention should have been first directed to England, whose institutions of learning have conferred upon her so memorable a renown. It is not strange that they should have turned from the institutions of the Continent to the great Universities founded by Sigebert and Alfred, and enriched by the magnificent endowments of William of Wykeham, and William of Waynflete, of Wolsley, and Henry VIII. Nor is it strange that they should have attributed the superior scholarship of England entirely to the Universities, and hoped to obtain a similar scholarship for our own country by merely endowing Universities here.

But this hope, we think, is delusive. It is based upon a fallacy which may occasion much mischief. The Universities comprise but a part of the system which has made English scholarship so famous: a close examination will show that they do but a portion of the educating, and that behind the Universities is a power without whose aid they would be vastly less efficient. This power is found in the *Training Schools*, which lay the foundations on which the Universities build. Without the great Public Schools, the Universities would almost stand still; for an ill-taught boy could no more avail himself of their instruction, than a savage understand the *Principia Mathematica* of Newton. It would be difficult to assign a limit to the benefit which these Schools have conferred upon the nation. Their training is perhaps less purely intellectual, but more symmetrical than that pursued in the Gymnasias of Germany. What their tuition does towards furnishing the mind, their dis-



cipline does towards forming the character. Their high mental training, their internal discipline, their very games are calculated to make *men*, and such men as no other system can show. The royal schools are the glory of England, and the true developers of her national character,—

“——Genus unde Latinum  
Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romæ.”

We say “developers of her national character,” because to these Schools we must attribute much of that honest, manly spirit, that detestation of meanness, and that chivalrous daring which mark the English gentleman; for although most of these Schools limit the number of their pupils by statute, their influence extends over the whole nation. And it is a good influence, too, which any nation might be glad to have, an influence which will sustain the renown of England when her ships and colonies shall have passed away, and which, indeed, is no slight guarantee of her stability; for the youth whose sinews have been strung, and whose eye quickened by the hardy exercises of the school play-ground, is found serviceable to the country in Peninsular and Indian wars. “The puppies fight well,” said the Duke of Wellington of the dandy regiment which went into action for the first time at Waterloo; but, in fact, it was no new thing to them. They had been accustomed from boyhood to desperate encounters of masses striving foot to foot and eye to eye. They had fought hard battles years before, in England, in the School House Match, when “our house played the whole of the school at foot ball,” when the entire school came rushing on in close column “straight for our goals, determined to conquer us or die!” An English school-game is not merely an amusement, but a science, in which mind and body are both ardently enlisted, and both vastly developed. Aside from the classical instruction which they impart, these Schools fulfill the highest mission of any system of Education,—an elevation of the national character. But this is only a part of their work,—an incidental, and, comparatively, a small part. We have said that the Universities are dependent on the Public Schools for material, and the latter must see to it that the material be not defective. There must be no half-way work. The machinery is the best, hence no defects in the work will be excused. They are Government Schools, supported by the Crown, amply endowed, deriving vast revenues from their pupils, under the protection of the Church, and designed to benefit both Church and State. With such immense advantages, it would be unpardonable if they



did not excel. The standards in the Universities are high, and the Public Schools must work up to them, or they would be useless. In examining the system pursued in these Schools, it is satisfactory to know that they play their parts with transcendent ability. It is true that to accomplish what they do, they must use corresponding means. They subject their pupils to a severity of training which is more safely hinted at than practiced, in this country. Their pupils are sent to them at a tender age, the average being about eleven. We are told by Mr. Bristed, that a boy cannot enter the lower School of Eton after his thirteenth, nor the upper School after his fourteenth year.\* For how many years do they labor at Latin versification! By how many griefs do they atone for false syntax! By how intense an exertion do they acquire that masterly knowledge of the elements of the Latin and Greek Languages, which must form the basis in their University career, and enable them to confront classical tripos examinations! How unyielding are the requirements, and how sure the penalty of their non-fulfillment! Roger Ascham, in his Preface to the Schoolmaster, has given us some idea of the discipline observed in his own time: "I have strange news brought me, saith Mr. Secretary, this morning, that divers scholars of Eton be run away from the School for fear of beating." There is reason to believe that while modern Etonians are required, like captive Israel of old, to furnish an undiminished tale of bricks, their unrelenting task-masters have not added to the quantity of straw.

Nor can there be any embarrassment attending such severe requirements, as there would be in an American College, for these Schools are the most independent corporations that can be found. Why is it that we find so much more docility in the English school-boy than in the American? It cannot arise from any lack of spirit in the former, as any American youth who is curious on the subject, may ascertain. But the true reason will be found in the immense power wielded by the Public Schools; they sustain themselves, and sustain each other; and woe to the boy who is expelled an English School! for he shall no more enter either School or University in that Kingdom. It may be said that the intense attachment which the boy feels for his School and his house preserves his decorum, and this is in a measure true; but it must be remembered that this very attachment springs from the fame of the school itself, (which, in turn, arises from its strict requirements,) by which his pride is enlisted and his sympathies involved, and

---

\* Five years in an English University, by Charles Astor Bristed.



not from any accidental associations among which he may have been thrown. These schools are further independent because they have a firm hold upon the public mind: the nation is proud of them, and justly proud, for there can be no question of their excellence. They have also the *prestige* of age. Through successive reigns of her Kings, they have become more and more firmly rooted in the heart of England; and their influence penetrates every department of society. They are not like too many of our American Colleges which come up in a night and perish in a night, and which have scarcely begun to live before they die and are forgotten. But the great English Schools have stood there for ages,—the same glowing centres of intellectual light! They have trained the sons of the nobility and gentry, not for one or two generations merely, but for centuries. Winchester College dates back to the reign of King Richard II, A. D. 1387. Eton College was founded by King Henry VI, A. D. 1446; the Schools at Shrewsbury and Marlborough, and Christ's Hospital, by Edward VI; and both Harrow and Rugby are as old as the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign. But more than this, their resources are ample; they have Libraries, Halls, Chapels, and all that can be desired for promoting the mental and moral elevation of the student. Their revenues are large. Shrewsbury, whose endowment is comparatively small, has a yearly income of three thousand pounds sterling; and Rugby, not the wealthiest, a yearly income of five thousand. These endowments have probably increased of late years. In addition, they derive vast sums from their tuition fees. Their patronage is extensive. The seventy picked foundation scholars of Eton, selected by examination, amid a wonderfully keen competition, present an array of youthful talents and energy which we would in vain look for in any of our Institutions, excepting West Point, where the ordeal is equally severe. Their history is potent: they have been the nurseries of the nation's genius; her poets, her orators, her heroes, have sported beneath these trees, or mused under the shadow of these towers; and the boy's mind is inspired with a reverential homage as he finds himself surrounded by the mightiest spirits of the past. Thus sustained by wealth, by age, by patriotic pride, and by their own intrinsic excellence, the Public Schools firmly maintain their position, and bid defiance to assault from without and from within.

But what is their religious tone? We are met at the threshold of our inquiry by our recollections of one whose name is intimately blended with the Public Schools of England, and whose



fame looms up far above that of his cotemporaries. A man in mind, and in heart a child; combining the experience of age with the innocence of immortal youth, the most active labors with the most ardent Christian devotion; the most gentle humility with the highest intellectual attainments,—such was Thomas Arnold, Doctor of Divinity, Head Master of Rugby School! Whatever may have been his Theological opinions,—and this is not the place to discuss them—there can be no question that he revolutionized the schools throughout the kingdom by introducing a religious element which will be felt for generations. He taught his pupils that Religion is a reality,—something not merely to be contemplated and assented to, but to be practiced, and carried into every work; not for dreamers, but for workers; that it is not intended to conflict with any ordinary duty, or any rational enjoyment of life, but that it aids the one and regulates the other; that Skepticism and Indifference are no marks of a cultivated mind! that *Right is Right*, and that it was cowardly to abandon it. Religion was not exhibited at a distance; the boy was not taught to view it through a medium of uncertainty or distrust, but it was brought home to his own mind, and presented as a companion whose ways are pleasantness, and whose paths, peace. Hence, far from deriding, he honored and sought to win it. Doubtless, all this had been said in substance before, but it had not been said as Arnold said it. It had not been developed as he developed it. A new light seemed to descend from Heaven and illuminate those young hearts, as their honored chief told them of the love of Jesus and the priceless value of the Redemption which He had purchased for them amid the death agonies of Calvary. A high toned Christian piety began to manifest itself among the pupils; and the results are still seen, not in Rugby only, but in most of the other Schools, so that the religious influence which prevails is far more sound than that which we find in our own colleges, where, alas! Christianity is more frequently treated as a harmless speculation than as a most priceless Revelation of God.

But, both the Public Schools and the Universities of England are especially dear to us, because they belong to that Mother Church to which our own is so largely “indebted, under God, for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection.” The training which they impart is Church training. “The Universities,” says Mr. Emerson,\* “are parcel of the Ecclesiastical system, and their first duty is

---

\* English Traits, p. 220.



to form the Clergy. Thus the Clergy for a thousand years have been the Scholars of the nation." It is hardly possible to calculate the power which the universities place at the disposal of the established Church. These are the strongholds of the Faith. In the battles in which the Church of England has been engaged they have ever led the van, and in her adversity they have clung to her with more than filial affection. The enemies of that Church have ever regarded the Colleges which crown the banks of the Isis and the Cam as the bulwarks of her power. There have ever been assembled her ablest defenders; there is the great armory whence, from age to age, she has drawn the weapons of her defense. The Universities have encountered the rage of the Puritan and of the Romanist in the day of their power. The Puritan determined to ruin them, the Romanist determined to subdue and corrupt them. Each was powerful; each was unscrupulous. From the bigotry of the Puritan they were saved by the good sense of the Lord Protector, whose far-sighted policy saw in the destruction of the Universities an indelible blot upon his name. "He felt," says M. Guizot,\* "that their destruction would be a source of degradation to his country and of dishonor to himself, and he therefore took them under his protection." The Puritan hated them with a hatred only equaled by that which he felt towards Antichrist enthroned on the Vatican Hill. He saw no beauty in those architectural treasures of the Middle Ages which were the admiration of Europe, nor any glory to his country in those splendid foundations which past ages had bequeathed to the service of Religion. He saw in them only "Camps of Cain and synagogues of Satan, stews of Antichrist and houses of lies." He bent his insane power against "these great schools in which candidates for the Christian ministry were instructed in ancient and profane literature, . . . these powerful institutions which existed of themselves, were self-governed by fixed rules, and formed an independent empire of human knowledge and tradition."† Cromwell, bent on saving the Universities, sent Doctor John Owen to Oxford as his Vice-Chancellor,—a wise choice, for although Owen "wore Spanish boots, large knots of ribbon at his knees, and a cocked hat," as the historian informs us, he did good service in defending the Universities against more serious innovation. But neither Cromwell nor Owen knew how great a benefit they were conferring on the Protestant cause in saving these renowned Institutions from Puritan Vandalism;

---

\* History of Oliver Cromwell, vol. 2, p. 158.† *Ib.*



had they lived one generation longer, they would have seen the Universities engaged in a deadly struggle with the great enemy—Rome. Although their influence on the Church of England has always been great, it was never more needed nor ever wielded with so much power as in that tremendous conflict which the Church of England waged with the Church of Rome, in the reign of King James II. Forty years before, the Puritan had been in power, had persecuted the Church of England to the death, and sought to destroy the Universities; now the Romanist was in power, a champion of the Church of Rome was on the throne, carrying out those designs which struck at the religion, the constitutional liberties, and the Educational system of the nation. Scarce a century had passed since the Jesuits had been driven from the land to which they now returned by invitation of the king and in defiance of the laws. They were to be seen gliding through the passages of Whitehall, and elevating the Host in the Royal chapel. They opened Seminaries for the instruction of youth almost under the shadow of St. Paul's. And with the Jesuits came a swarm of Benedictines, White Friars and Franciscans, all arrayed against the Church of England, with the king of England for their captain. But, the Church of England did not decline the contest. Assailed as she was on every side, she defended herself with an ability that enraged and utterly confounded her enemies. Macaulay, who cannot be charged with partiality for the Church, has given us an account of this contest, which we here transcribe, because it bears directly upon the subject we are discussing.

"The defenders of the Church of England," he says,\* "were a numerous, an intrepid, and a well appointed band of combatants. Among them were eloquent declaimers, expert dialecticians, scholars deeply read in the writings of the Fathers and in all parts of Ecclesiastical History. . . . In the van appeared a rank of steady and skillful veterans, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Sherlock, Prideaux, Whitby, Patrick, Tenison, Wake. The rear was brought up by the most distinguished bachelors of arts who were studying for Deacon's Orders. Conspicuous among the recruits whom Cambridge sent to the field was a distinguished pupil of the great Newton, Henry Wharton, who had, a few months before, been senior wrangler of his year, and whose early death was soon after deplored by men of all parties as an irreparable loss to letters; Oxford was not less proud of a youth whose great powers, first essayed in this conflict, afterwards troubled the Church and the State during forty eventful years, Francis Atterbury. By such men as these every question at issue between the Papists and the Protestants was debated, sometimes in a popular style which boys and women could comprehend, sometimes with the utmost subtilty of logic, and sometimes with an immense display of learning. The pretensions of the Holy See, the authority of tradition, purgatory, transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the adoration of the Host, the denial of the cup to the laity, Confession, Penance, Indulgences, Extreme

---

\* History of England, vol. 2, cap. 6.



Uction, the Invocation of saints, the adoration of images, the celibacy of the Clergy, the monastic vows, the practice of celebrating public worship in a tongue unknown to the multitude, the corruptions of the court of Rome, the history of the Reformation, the characters of the chief reformers, were copiously discussed.

. . . . . The Roman Catholics did not yield the victory without a struggle. . . . . But with the exception of some bad translations of Bossuet's admirable works their establishments put forth nothing of the smallest value. It was, indeed, impossible for any intelligent and candid Roman Catholic to deny that the champions of his Church were, in every talent and acquirement, completely overmatched. The ablest of them would not, on the other side, have been considered as of the third rate." The chief reason which the historian assigns for the defeat of the Romanists deserves to be noted. "They had been excluded by their religion from English schools and universities."

In view of the benefits which the academical system of England has conferred upon her Church, is it not to be lamented that our own Church possesses no corresponding element of power? Glancing over our land studded with *quasi* Universities, how many do we find whose influence is friendly to us? How many whose influence is not positively hostile to us? It is undeniable that while our Church contributes more to the diffusion of higher Education in this country than any other denomination in proportion to its numbers, we are not adequately represented in the Colleges. While we have several Institutions of acknowledged merit, it is notorious that the oldest and most influential in the country are conducted by those who are inimical to us. The Puritan, at an early day, established Colleges in New England and zealously sustained them, and well they have since repaid him! The Romanist is establishing Colleges throughout the great Valley of the Mississippi, and it is no exaggeration to say that he is thus accomplishing more for the interests of his Church in this country, than by all other efforts combined. The time has now arrived when we must either make some exertion, or consent to be left far behind in the intellectual race.

And indeed, if we now avail ourselves of the feeling which is spreading throughout the country, we shall have reserved our efforts to some purpose. We have said that our countrymen, sensible of their deficiency in sound scholarship, have been shamed into making an effort to supply it. They are beginning to discover that in their intense endeavors to accumulate wealth, they have not been sufficiently mindful of a power which, if neglected, will vindicate itself at their expense. They are beginning to discover that there is need of a higher grade of education, and they are willing that it be of a Christian kind. They are beginning to discover that by ignoring religion in our Colleges, we encourage skepticism and infidelity.

When years ago, in the newly settled portions of our country,



the question was asked, How shall we obtain Colleges? discerning men saw that they could only be established under the auspices of the State, for no religious denomination was sufficiently wealthy to endow them. No one thought of the religious influence to which the pupils were to be subjected, nor indeed was it regarded as an important consideration. The State is connected with no religion, and it may be conjectured that if the State build the College, religious influence will not enter far into the design. It may be tolerated, if it behave with sufficient humility, but it must not presume to obtrude itself into any important sphere of academical instruction. We are far from censuring the State for declining to transcend its functions and for living up to the letter of its constitution. It can only regard men as citizens, nor can it make any distinction in favor of any Creed. We do not desire that it should make any. Yet we may, perhaps, be pardoned for suggesting that a system which may be well adapted to governing an Empire is not necessarily adapted to training the young. The wheels of Government may revolve without the aid of the religious power, but can we dispense with it when we come to form the character? What a curse is education of the brain, without a corresponding education of the heart! We are told, indeed, that religious exercises form a part of the routine in most of our Colleges, but we think that they are rather an apology for something better, than desirable in themselves. What is the sum of these exercises? The students are assembled twice (in some cases only once) a day to their devotions; a chapter of the Bible is read; an extemporaneous prayer is delivered, and they are dismissed to their other duties. Beyond a compulsory attendance, at some service on Sundays, no further religious training is attempted. If it be said that this is as much as the majority of them would receive at home, we answer that it is by no means as much as they ought to receive there, and we think it falls far short of that culture of the heart which the welfare of the young requires.

This system is pernicious in another point of view: not only does it slight religion, but it inflicts a deadly wound upon it by encouraging Schism. All Christendom deplores the divisions into which it is now rent. If then Schism be an evil, what multipliers of evil must our Colleges be? To what bitter jealousies do they give rise, and how widely do they separate jealous denominations of Christians! Many of them are, in this respect, in a deplorable condition. They have been established on the plan of not mixing "Sectarianism" with their instruction, and the consequence is not only a contempt for all



religion among the mass of students, but a hearty hatred of each other among the denominations represented in the Faculty. The Churchman is opposed to the Methodist, the Methodist to the Presbyterian, the Presbyterian to the Baptist, and the Baptist to all. Each denomination thinks itself slighted, and each threatens to array its influence against the institution. What must be the effect of this on the student's mind? Will it be said that the differences are unimportant? He knows too well that they are not treated as such. What must be his reflections when in his College Chapel, he sees an Episcopalian President; a Presbyterian Professor of Latin; a Methodist Professor of Greek; a Baptist Professor of Rhetoric; and a Pantheistic Professor in some other department? And this is no overdrawn picture. Constituted as these Colleges are, there is no remedy for the evil, for their Professors are generally required to subscribe to no Creed whatever.

But the evil consequences of such a system are daily becoming more apparent; hence, those of our people who desire to introduce a higher system of education are willing that it be of a Christian kind, and in their desire for this Christian scholarship they have turned to us to supply it. The connection of our own with that venerable Church whose Christian learning has elevated her to the first rank in Christendom, and the fact that many of our Clergy have been educated in Europe, have given us a prominence in this movement which has been less sought than forced upon us. Whether we shall be able to meet the want is a question which the experience of time and the verdict of an impartial world must determine. But we may be said to have already accepted the responsibility. Eight Prelates, supported by their Dioceses, have resolved to establish in the South Western portion of our Union, an University worthy of the Church, of the Country and of the Age. They have elected Trustees, and a State Legislature has pronounced them a body corporate and politic in law. An enterprising company has presented a vast tract of land, and guaranteed many valuable privileges, with but slight restrictions on the donees. Their charter gives them power "to establish literary and scientific departments, and those of Law, Theology and Medical Science." The new Institution is established under the auspices, not of the State, but of the Church; and if we may judge from the statements of its officers, it is designed to combine sound religious training with its literary and scientific advantages.

How far will this new Institution exert a beneficial influence on the Church? It must either resolve to sink to a level with



our ordinary Colleges, or it must from the first assume a position above them. If it be content to sink to the level of an ordinary American College, it requires no prophetic power to foretell that its influence will be insignificant. Our country already possesses a sufficient number of third and fourth rate Colleges. If the new University be designed merely to provide us with another such ; if it admit pupils inadequately prepared into its classes ; if it concentrate its energies on the conferring of Degrees ; if its graduates are destined to assume no higher rank among scholars than the graduates of our other Colleges, we may rest assured that its influence on the Church will be far from happy.

But, if it be designed to rise and assume a position similar to that which the European Universities occupy ; if it provide such advantages that its graduates can mingle on terms of equality with the scholars of any nation ; if, in short, it impart to them an education similar to that which they can obtain in Europe, its influence will be vastly beneficial to us.

But to provide such training, it must work on the European plan. It must begin by sweeping away the vicious systems of instruction which have so long prevailed in this country, and adopt the system prevalent in England and Germany. It must begin at the beginning, and that beginning is the *Training School*. It must begin by resuming an element which our Colleges at an early day abandoned, and having raised its requirements for admission to a level with the European, it must train its pupils to meet them. It must begin the work of educational emancipation by endowing a Training School capable of drilling boys in the Classics, the pure Mathematics, and in Modern Languages, as they are drilled in the Public Schools of England, or the Gymnasia of Germany. And, having established such a Training School, it must be unyielding in the requirements which it has assumed, and abolish the absurd policy of admitting pupils, by examination, merely, into the higher classes of the University, before they have passed through the course prescribed for the preceding classes.

We do not enter into a discussion respecting the importance of providing foundation Scholarships and Fellowships, as this Article has already transcended the limits we had assigned it. Nor, while advocating the introduction of a better system of education among us, do we overlook the obstacles which its adoption may throw in the way of the new Institution. To assume a position above the other educational institutions in the land will require no ordinary nerve, and to maintain it will require no ordinary ability. But we think that in no other



way can it do justice to itself and to the Church which has adopted it. That the Church needs such institutions cannot be doubted; for it is essential to the success of our system that we should not only teach, but *train*; that we should not only teach the old, but train the young. It behooves us, then, carefully to study every step which is taken in the organization of the New University. There is much danger that, in the desire for a speedy organization, its future dignity and welfare will be sacrificed. We cannot reap before we have sown, and what we have sown, that shall we also reap. A University cannot, any more than a city, be built in a day. Resolutions on paper will not build it. Meetings of Committees will not build it. Fourth of July Orations will not build it. Mere enthusiasm will not build it. Nor will anything but an elevated system of instruction, thorough from its beginning, and unflinchingly adhered to, secure for it a permanent fame.

The University of the South will enter on its existence at a not inauspicious period, and if it persevere in a course of duty, the difficulties which will at first beset it must speedily disappear. The Board has wisely resolved to do nothing towards its organization until the sum of *five hundred thousand dollars* be secured for its endowment. If judiciously invested, this sum may yield an annual income of *fifty thousand* dollars. When it is remembered that the annual income of the University of Oxford is about seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars, the amount seems small for so great an undertaking; but, if the University attain that reputation which its friends desire, it can obtain further means. To the future action of its regents, the ablest minds of the Church and of the Nation are directed in hope. It was fitting that the suggestion of the plan should come from a Bishop, himself a graduate of that renowned Military Academy which has so long trained the children of the country in the highest departments of Science, and whose reputation is coextensive with the civilized world. It is fitting that the Church regard with concern an institution for whose success she has become responsible, which, if successful, will so greatly assist her career, and which promises to sanctify its labors by a devotion of the highest intellectual powers to God.



## ART. V.—ST. PATRICK NO ROMANIST.

1. *Historia B. Platinæ de Vitæ Pontificum Romanorum.* Colonie Agrippinæ. 1611. 4to. pp. 505.
2. *Bedæ (Venerabilis) Opera Omnia.* 8 vols. folio. Colonie Agrippinæ. 1612.
3. *Usseri (Jac.) Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates, etc.* Folio. London: 1687.
4. *Keating's History of Ireland. Translated from the original Irish Language.* By DERMOT O'CONNOR. 8vo. Dublin: 1841.
5. *Occasional Sermons, preached in Westminster Abbey, by Christopher Wordsworth, Canon of Westminster.* Fourth Series, on the Church of Ireland. London: Rivingtons. 8vo. 1852.

THE greatest of ancient philosophers, and the ablest of logicians, Aristotle, has very justly shown the great absurdity of expecting proofs equally incontrovertible regarding all things. Mathematics being a science of an abstract nature, and of definite quantities, is capable alone of a complete demonstration. By inferences deduced from actual experiments, propositions in Natural Philosophy are established. In Moral Philosophy, and on all moral subjects, the arguments must be of the moral kind; while the certainty of facts in history depends upon the credibility that is attached to the relaters. Granting it true that none of these proofs amounts to a demonstration strictly logical and perfect, yet, when proved by the best arguments the nature of the subject will bear, it would most assuredly be as great an absurdity to entertain a doubt regarding the certainty of the proposition, as that of the clearest mathematical demonstration.

However, in opposition to these plain principles, there are millions of Romanists throughout the world who persist in asserting that ST. PATRICK was a strict and rigid Roman Catholic. Some there are, most certainly, who ignorantly believe it. Others assert it, who are aware that the proofs to the contrary are as convincing as history can make them; which shall be



abundantly shown in this Article, from the writings of Romish historians.

Perhaps it is but right, before doing so, to make some remarks in regard to the place of St. Patrick's nativity, and his early life. We know that no fewer than seven cities have contended for the birth of Homer, the prince of poets; and nearly as many nations have contended for the honor of giving birth to the illustrious St. Patrick, the Apostle of the "Island of Saints." Joceline and Usher assert that he was born at a place called Kirkpatrick, near the city of Glasgow, where the rampart had been built which separated the barbarians from the Roman possessions. They tell us that a mighty British prince named Rethmit, and his seven sons, with a powerful army, invaded Gaul, killed the parents of Patrick, took him, with his brother and sister, captives; passed over victoriously to Ireland, where they sold them to some Irish princes. Now, the time in which these events are said to have occurred, must have been between the year of St. Patrick's birth, in 373, and that of his mission to Ireland, which is by all admitted to have been in or about 432.

But, unfortunately for the supporters of this claim, history opposes and annihilates every one of their assertions. Bede tells us, that the Britons groan beneath the cruelty of their oppressors; "they are driven," he says, "by their barbarous enemies to the sea; the sea repels them back upon their enemies;" therefore, unable to make an incursion into Gaul, or any other country. Some writers assert that our Saint was an Irishman; others, that he was an Englishman; and some say that he was a Welshman; while others write that he was a Scotch Highlander. It is also said, in Colgan's collection, that it was reported of St. Patrick, that he deduced his origin from the Holy Land; that a Roman army, shortly after our Saviour's Passion, laid waste the country of Palestine, made many of the Jews captives, and dispersed them over the world. From some of them was our Saint descended. Our own opinion is in favor of Scotland or France, as the land of St. Patrick's birth, though we think it useless to contend for it in this Article, as there are so many conflicting opinions current in regard to it. Mr. O'Sullivan, in his *Patrician Decad*, or *Life of St. Patrick*, asserts that our Saint was born at Bretagne, in France; others again, that he was born at Holy Tours. All admit that his father's name was Calphurnius, a Deacon, his mother's, Conchessa, who was the sister of the celebrated St. Martin, Archbishop of Tours. He was born about 373, and died about A. D. 432. It is but right to observe that he was



not called Patrick at his baptism, as Mr. O'Sullivan tells us, but Souchet, (or Succath,) "for," saith he, "Souch, in the old French, means truncus, a stock of a tree; and that Souchet is trunculus, a little stock;" and he says further, that "the name was very well adapted to the Saint, for he was a most plentiful stock, from whom so many Irish prelates, so many priests, so many preachers, and so many doctors of foreign nations, have proceeded."

In reference to our saint's early years, very little can be gathered from his biographers. He tells us of himself, that, at the age of sixteen, he was ignorant of God, that is, he possessed no true knowledge of Him, for he was always a Christian. He was carried into captivity by some barbarians, in his sixteenth year. They brought him into Ireland, where he was compelled to tend cattle, being cruelly treated. Here God had pity on his soul and quickened him to a sense of his duty, by the impulse of a strong interior grace. He continued six whole years in servitude, and in the seventh he was released. He at once resolved on visiting his relations, who gladly welcomed him, and with whom he remained two years. Before departing from the home of his relations, the story runs, that he had one night a dream, in which he saw a man coming to him, as if from Ireland, whose name was Victoricius, having some letters; one of which he gave him to read, in which were these words: "*Vox Hiberni generum*," the voice of the Irish. And while reading it, he thought he heard the inhabitants cry, "We entreat thee young man, holy youth, to come and walk among us." He awoke greatly amazed at this vision or dream. He tells us, "that after many years, he thanked God he had dealt with them according to their crying out." He at once formed the resolution of going to Ireland to attempt their conversion; and commenced his studies under the direction of his mother's uncle, the pious St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, who ordained him Deacon. He was ordained Priest by St. German, Bishop of Auxerre. By whom he was consecrated Bishop, is disputed. He tells us himself, in his letter to King Coriticus, "that he was made a Bishop in Ireland, and ascribes his mission to a divine impulse, which he received from God."—*Hiberione constitum episcopum me esse fateor—Certissime a Deo accepi quod sum.* He might have been consecrated by Irish Bishops, as there were many in that Island before his arrival: the names of four are given; i. e., St. Kieran, St. Aibbe, St. Declan, and St. Ibar, whom Usher calls the forerunners of St. Patrick. But it is more than probable that he was consecrated by the pious Bishops St. German



and St. Lopus, who accompanied our saint into Ireland, early in the fifth century.

In regard to St. Patrick's consecration by Pope Celestine, the learned Roman Catholic historian, Dr. Lanigan, says, "that it is not to be met with in any life of the saint except these two compilations of ALL STORIES, namely, Joceline's and the Tripartite, whence it made its way into some Breviaries and other late documents."

Again; Lanigan says, "that it is a *fable to pretend that St. Patrick received the Pallium at Rome*, and that *this nonsense* has been sufficiently refuted."\*

He says again, "that Cardinal Papiron distributed the first Palls (Pallea) in Ireland, at the Synod of Kells, A. D. 1151.† In the face of all this, that bold Jesuit, the Romish Bishop Milner, states in his "*End of Controversy*,"‡ "on the authority of Archbishop Usher!!! that *St. Patrick received the Pallium and title of Pope's Legate from Pope Hilarius*, in A. D. 462." Here Milner is guilty of a barefaced falsehood; for Archbishop Usher states, that "*Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick, was the first Legate of the Roman Bishop in Ireland*."§ And again, that "We read of sundry Bishops that have been in this land between the days of St. Patrick and Malachy. Which one of them can be named that ever sought a PALL from Rome?"|| And the Roman Catholic Historian, Father Godfrey Keating, tells us "that the bestowal of the four copes—Pallia—upon the four Archbishops, *was very ungrateful to the Irish*, and that they would have *preferred the OLD FORMS*."¶

And again, the same historian states, "that whoever gave to Pope Adrian IV, the account of the Irish Church, which led to his Bull granting Ireland to Henry II, was as GREAT AN ENEMY TO THE TRUTH as he was to the glory of the Irish nation."\*\* That our saint was never at Rome, and never received a mission from Pope Celestine, is evident from the fact that Prosper, the Romanist, and intimate friend of Celestine, never mentions one word of him in his Chronicle, though he does not fail to mention the effort of Palladius only one year before, i. e., 431, short and trifling though that effort was. And Platina, a Romanist, who wrote the lives of the Popes down to Sixtus IV, tells us of Palladius, in his life of Celestine, but not a word *does he write* of the illustrious St. Patrick, or

\* Eccl. Hist., IV, p. 110.

† Ib., IV, p. 146.

‡ Page 19, Dublin edition, 1830.

§ Antiq. A. D. 1130.

|| Rel. Anc. Irish, C. VIII.

¶ Hist. of Ireland, Vol. II, p. 333, Ed. Dublin, 1809.

\*\* Hist. of Ireland, II, 369.



of his important work, so much greater than that of Palladius. Notwithstanding, we are asked to believe that St. Patrick was sent by Pope Celestine. Mr. O'Halloran, the Romish historian, states that the Irish received the faith from the Asiatic Churches, and one part of St. Patrick's policy was carefully to avoid hurting the national pride; and, therefore, that we do not find him even hinting at any foreign supremacy!!\* And Dr. O'Conner, another Romanist, in his third letter of "*Columbanus ad Hibernos*," states "that the ancient Irish *always appointed their own Bishops*, without so much as the knowledge of Rome."

In this same century, 664, Wilfrid, an adherent of the Papal Church, was appointed to the See of York, and would not be consecrated by any Irish Bishop, because THEY WERE NOT IN COMMUNION WITH ROME.

And the venerable Bede, a Romanist, gives us a copy of a letter of Laurentius, who succeeded Augustine in the See of Canterbury, A. D. 609, in which he says, "that Daganus, an Irish Bishop, not only *refused to eat with us, but even to take his repast in the same house where we were entertained*,"† manifestly showing that the Irish Church was not only independent of, but even held no communion with, the Roman See.

The Popish Cardinal Baronius states in his *Annals*,‡ that "all the Irish in the seventh century were schismatics, separated from the See of Rome."

And Pope Honorius, in this century, wrote to the Irish Bishops on account of their *opposition in doctrine and practice to Rome*, entreating of them not to be making themselves "wiser than the Churches of Christ."§

In a compilation of Canons of the Anglo-Saxon Church, A. D. 700, it is said, "The Bishops of the Scots—this was the ancient name of the Irish from the fourth to the eleventh century—in the matter of Easter and *tonsure*, are not united to the (R.) Catholic Church."

Moreover, the titular Archbishop Talbot, a predecessor of Paul Cullen, the present Romish Archbishop in the See of Dublin, states in his works,|| that there *never was a lawful primate in Ireland till Malachy, in the twelfth century!* and that St. Patrick even was not a *lawful primate*, not being appointed by the Pope. But, if our saint had been sent from Rome to Ireland; if he had been consecrated at Rome; if he

\* O'Halloran's Irish Hist., pp. 13, 18, 23.

† A. D. 566-604.

‡ "Primatus Dubliniensis," pp. 17-41.

§ Bede, Book II, C. 4.

§ Bede, Eccl. Hist. lib. II, cap. 19.



had been a dependent of Rome ; if he owed subjection to the Papal See, at Rome, either temporally or spiritually, would he have been silent in regard to Rome in his Confession ? Thus much for one point in our argument, that St. Patrick was no Romanist.

Let us now refer to the celebrated Hymn of St. Patrick, called "St. Patrick's Armour, or Breastplate," in order that we may be able to ascertain whether or no St. Patrick held or taught the Popish doctrine of "Invocation of Saints," or sought the intercession of the "Immaculate Virgin Mary." It is a beautiful prayer in metre, intended by him as a preservative against all the dangers that might beset him in his way to Tara, to preach before King Leogaire and his court. He first makes a profession of faith in the blessed Trinity, in the incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ ; he concludes thus : "Christ be with me ; Christ after me ; Christ under me ; Christ over me ; Christ at my right hand ; Christ at my left ; Christ at this side ; Christ at that side ; salvation is the Lord's ; salvation is Christ's ; may Thy salvation, O Lord, be always with us."

Let us now contrast this with the teaching of the Papal Church. In the decree of the Council of Trent, on the Invocation and veneration of Saints, it is decreed—"The Holy Synod commands the Bishops and others, who have the office and care of instruction, that they, according to the custom of the (R.) Catholic Apostolic Church, which *has been received from the first ages of the Christian religion*, the consent of the Holy Fathers, and the decrees of Sacred Councils, make it a chief point, diligently to instruct the faithful concerning the intercession and the invocation of Saints ; teaching them, that the Saints, reigning together with Christ, offer to God their prayers for men, and that it is good and useful to invoke them with supplications, and on account of the benefits obtained from God, through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, \* \* \* that they who deny that the Saints, enjoying eternal happiness in Heaven, are to be invoked—or who assert, either that they do not pray for men, or that the invoking them that they may pray for each of us, *is idolatry*, or that it is contrary to the honor of God, and *opposed to the honor of the one Mediator* between God and man, or that it is folly either in word or thought, to supplicate them—are to be accursed."

This extract from Trent speaks for itself. We give another quotation on this subject from St. Patrick. He says : "My constant prayer was, to be filled with the fear and love of God. My faith was enlarged, and my spirit augmented ; I arose be-



fore day to my prayers, in the snow, in the frost, in the rain, (while serving his owner in Ireland,) and I received no damage; nor was I affected with slothfulness, for then the spirit of God was warm within me."

Let us contrast the foregoing with a quotation or two from one of the works of a Saint of Roman manufacture. We quote from a book entitled "The Glories of Mary." The author, Alphonso Liguori, was canonized and beatified so lately as the year 1839, by the late Pope, Gregory XVI. Four Popes, it is stated in the title page, have expressed their approbation of the life and writings of this Saint; and we are informed in the preface, that the Council at Rome, the sacred Congregation of Rites having made the most rigorous examination of the writings of the Saint, to the number of a hundred or more, pronounced that there was nothing in them deserving of censure; and this sentence we find was approved by Pope Pius VII, in 1803, by his successor, Leo XII, and also by Pope Urban VIII, and in 1839, St. Liguori was canonized by Pope Gregory XVI. It is thus asserted in the preface, that it contains nothing but what is consistent with the doctrines of the (R.) Catholic Church, and that it may be used by the faithful for the instruction and edification of their souls.

At page 35, we read, "Queen of Heaven and of Earth! Mother of God! My Sovereign Mistress! I present myself before you, as a poor mendicant before a mighty queen. From the height of your throne, deign to cast your eyes upon a poor miserable sinner, and lose not sight of him till you render him truly holy. O, illustrious virgin! you are the queen of the universe, and consequently mine. I desire to consecrate myself more particularly to thy service; dispose of me according to your good pleasure. Direct me; *I abandon myself wholly* to your conduct. Chastise me, if I disobey you. I am then no longer mine; *I am all yours. Save me, O, powerful queen, save me.*"

Page 136, "You, O, Mary, have the *keys* of divine mercy; *all who trust in Mary*, will see Heaven's gates open to receive them. She is the gate of Heaven, since the (R.) Church styles her Janna Cœli. The Holy (R.) Church styles her also the Star of the Sea." We give another extract, in order to exhibit more fully the awful blasphemy of this anti-Christian and sadly fallen Church. Page 177 we read, that "Brother Leo once saw in a vision, two ladders reaching to heaven; one red, at the summit of which was Jesus Christ; and the other white, at the top of which presided his blessed mother. He observed, that many who endeavored to ascend to Heaven by the red



ladder, at the top of which was Christ, after mounting a few steps, fell down, and on trying again were equally unsuccessful; but a voice from the summit of the white ladder, at which sat Mary, told them to ascend, they did so, and entered immediately into Heaven, the blessed virgin having held out her hands to receive them." And thus it is that millions of Romanists are taught, that if they attempt to get to heaven by the blessed Saviour they will be rejected; but if they make the effort to ascend by the Virgin Mary from the lowest depths of sin to the heights of glory, they will find more mercy in her than in Him who "loved us and gave himself for us."

Again, St. Patrick held the true Catholic doctrine of the necessity of studying the Holy Scriptures, and reading them to the people. For even Joceline, the monk, in his "Life of St. Patrick," cap. 4, says, "he used to read the Bible to the people for days and nights together." We now place in juxtaposition the teaching of Rome on this point. Pius the VII, writing to the Archbishop of Gnezu, in 1816, calls the Bible Society a "most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined," a "pestilence," and "defilement of the faith most imminently dangerous to souls." Leo XII, in 1824, speaking of the same Society, says that it "strolls with effrontery throughout the world, contemning the traditions of the holy Fathers, and contrary to the well known decree of the Council of Trent, labors with all its might, and by every means, to translate, or rather to pervert, the Holy Scriptures into the *vulgar languages* of every nation; from which proceeding it is greatly to be feared, that what is ascertained to have happened to some passages, may also occur with regard to other passages; to wit, that by a perverse interpretation, the gospel of Christ be turned into a human gospel, or what is still worse, into the gospel of the devil." The Romish Bishops to whom this was written, most willingly received it at the time in the land of St. Patrick, and unlike him, charged their flocks to deliver up to their parish priests all copies of the Holy Bible. And Cardinal Wiseman, one of the editors of the Dublin Review, was of opinion, that the inquirer into religion will be "*led astray* by adhering solely to the Scriptures." Not so, the eminent St. Patrick. He knew that the Divine Word maketh wise unto Salvation; and he taught it publicly from house to house.

Again, St. Patrick knew nothing of Priestly Celibacy. For he says in his confession, "That he was the son of Calphurnius, a deacon, and the grandson of Politus, a priest. And one of the Canons of the synod of Armagh, held by the saint, enacted



a penalty against any *wife of a clergyman* who should go out without her head covered or veiled. But marriage is forbidden to all the clergy of the Papal Church. This was authoritatively settled in the eleventh century. Vows of celibacy voluntarily imposed by Romanists upon themselves, are thought highly meritorious, and they are known by the epithet of "the religious." This preference is opposed to the teaching of Scripture, and to the teaching of the holy St. Patrick. The awful wretchedness which this unscriptural dogma has entailed on hundreds of its victims, and the infamy and vice into which it has plunged hundreds more, are too well known to require proof, and too offensive to be noticed here with more than a passing allusion. As God's blessing is always connected with sincere obedience to His divine Will, His curse seems to rest upon every proud, self-righteous attempt to be wise above that which is written, or holy above what is commanded.

It is also manifest from St. Patrick's well-known tract called "The Three Habitations," that he did not believe in Purgatory. He makes the only abodes of the soul to be Heaven, Hell, and Earth. The learned Romish historian, Dr. Lanigan, feels so puzzled at this, that he endeavors to evade its force by saying \* that "Purgatory must have been omitted, because he was writing only of *permanent habitations*." But if so, why then was *earth* included? Is *earth* a *permanent habitation*? "I constantly hold," says Pope Pius in his Creed, "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful." In regard to Purgatory, the Council of Trent decreed, Twenty-fifth Session, as follows: "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the Mass;" and all Romish Bishops were enjoined that this "wholesome doctrine of Purgatory, delivered by venerable fathers and holy councils, should be believed and held by Christ's faithful people and everywhere taught and preached." St. Patrick never held it. He never taught it. And why? He knew nothing regarding it; it was not thought of for more than a century after his departure from the Church militant.

St. Patrick knew nothing of the elevation of the consecrated host, or of Communion in one kind. The Council of Constance in 1414, first decreed that "for just and weighty reasons the chalice, for the future, will be withheld from the laity and non-officia-

---

\* History, Vol. iii, p. 331.



ting clergy." And every papist now living is, we are sure, quite willing to admit that the saint knew nothing of the Immaculate Conception of the blessed Virgin Mary, which was first given to the Christian world as an Article of Faith, A. D. 1853!

In a catalogue of Irish saints, noticed as being very valuable by the author, Dr. Lanigan,\* it is stated that "the first order of saints was in the time of Patrick; all the Bishops to the number of 350, were founders of Churches, were eminent, holy, full of the Holy Ghost; they had *one head, Christ*, and one leader, Patrick. Not a single word regarding a Pope, Jesus Christ's Vicar upon earth. Patrick was not a saint of Roman manufacture, for *the first saints*, of the "Island of Saints," who were raised to the dignity of that name by the See of Rome, were Malachy, who died A. D. 1148, and Lawrence, who died A. D. 1180.

It is now manifest, that we have almost exclusively transcribed from Roman writers; and we think that there can be but one conclusion, *i. e.*, that St. Patrick was wholly ignorant of the peculiar doctrines of the Romish sect now in Ireland, which sect was unknown there before the twelfth century, and even after that period, their authority was limited to the English settlements.† The *first Council* in Ireland which gave an order for regulating the Irish Church ritual or discipline uniformly with that of Rome, was the Synod of Cashel, A. D. 1172. The *first Episcopal appointment in Ireland*, in reference to which any influence of the Pope can be traced, is one made by Malachy, as Pope's Legate, in the nomination of a Bishop for Cork, A. D. 1140. In fact, it is most manifest from the history of the Irish Church, that till the Twelfth Century it was wholly independent of Rome, adhering strictly to the laws, canons, and rules, drawn up for their guidance under the great and illustrious St. Patrick, who was a faithful Bishop of the One, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and no Romanist.

We cannot better state the conclusions to which every candid reader of history must come on this subject, than in the language of the learned Archbishop USHER. He says, "As far as I can collect by such records of the former ages as have come into my hands, either MSS. or printed, the Religion professed by the ancient Bishops, Priests, Monks, and other Christians in this land, (*Ireland*), was, for the substance, the very same with that which now by public authority is maintained therein against the foreign Doctrines brought in thither in later times by

\* History, Vol. ii, p. 13.

† O'Conner, Hist., Add. 1, 10.



the Bishop of Rome's followers. I speak of the more substantial points of doctrines that are in controversy betwixt the Church of Rome and us at this day. The religion then received by both, (*Irish and Scotch*,) was the self-same, and differed little or nothing from that which was maintained by their neighbors the Britons."

The Archbishop shows this in respect to the following fundamental points :

1. "The Supremacy and sufficiency of Scripture as the Rule of Faith. The free use of Holy Scripture in the vernacular tongue ; the appeal to the inspired Originals as the Authentic Standard, and not to the Latin Version. The Canon of Scripture.

2. Justification, and its cognate questions.

3. Non-acknowledgment of Purgatory ; non-use of Prayers for the dead.

4. Non-imposition of Celibacy on the Clergy.

5. Non-recognition of supremacy, civil or ecclesiastical, in the Bishop of Rome."\*

It does not fall within our present plan to trace the process by which Rome acquired, first a foothold, and then supremacy, over Ireland and the Irish Church. For more than six hundred years, Christianity had flourished in Ireland, and the Church had enjoyed its ancient rights. Not until the beginning of the twelfth century, (A. D. 1106,) was a Papal Legate ever seen in Ireland. And then, alas ! it remained for an English Monarch, Henry II, in the lust of his unholy ambition, to rivet the chains which the Roman Pontiff (Adrian IV) had already forged. Let us thank God for the tokens, that, under the auspices of the English Church, that ancient Church of Ireland gives promise of returning again to her place, as a true, pure, integral Branch of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. Let us remember, too, that in our own labors to convert to the true faith of Christ the Irish who are brought providentially to our own doors, we are but restoring to them their own birthright. Let us not fail to speak the Truth in love ; to show all patience, kindness, and charity ; and we shall not labor in vain.

---

\* Usher's Rel. Anc. Irish. Epist. Ded.



## ART. VI.—THE NEW LITURGY IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

*A Service Book for Public Worship. Prepared especially for use in the Chapel of Harvard University.* Cambridge: John Bartlett. 1858. 12mo. pp. 308.

THE introduction of Liturgical Worship into the Chapel of Harvard University, the oldest of all our Colleges now existing, and taking rank in point of position, numbers, scholarship, and influence, as the very first, is an event which, as Church Reviewers, we can hardly be expected to pass by unnoticed. It is an event, too, which calls up some historical reminiscences, to which, first of all, we propose to advert.

The early Puritan settlers in the Massachusetts Colony, "wisely judging," says the American Annalist, "Learning and Religion to be the firmest pillars of the Church and Commonwealth," one of the very first things which they sought to establish on this new soil, was a public School or College. Among the colonists were many gentlemen who had been thoroughly educated in the old country. Savage, in his Note on Winthrop, says, "there were probably at that time forty or fifty sons of the University of Cambridge in Old England—one for every two hundred or two hundred and fifty inhabitants—dwelling in the few villages of Massachusetts and Connecticut. The sons of Oxford were not few." Hence, the proportion of well educated gentlemen in the country was probably greater then, than it ever has been since. As early as A. D. 1630, the General Court at Boston took measures for the establishment and endowment of the Institution which has ever since formed so conspicuous an element in the history of that Colony and Commonwealth, and of our whole country. A principal motive in the establishment of the College was, says Mr. Increase Mather, writing in 1697, "that so scholars might there be educated for the service of Christ and His Churches in the work of the Ministry."\* And to show what spirit then pervaded the College, in respect to the use of Liturgies, we find Mr. Samuel Mather, who graduated in 1643, and whose name in its list of Alumni appears as the first Fellow of the College, saying, "that for ministers instead of using their own ministerial gifts, to discharge the work of their

---

\* Cotton Mather's *Magnalia*, Vol. 2, Book IV, p. 63.



ministry by the prescriptions of others, is as bad as carrying the ark upon a cart, which was to have been carried upon the shoulders of the Levites; and it is a sin against the spirit of prayer for ministers in these days to be diverted from the primitive way of praying, which was, according to Tertullian's account, *sine monitore, quia de pectore*, in opposition to the præscript forms of prayer amongst the pagans.\* This language expresses, doubtless, the sentiment of the College at that day, as to all use of Liturgies in Public Worship. And the same writer, in a Sermon, which we have before us, declares, that a "præscript Liturgy is properly a maintenance for an idol dumb Ministry;" that it is like tying "bladders under the wings of sea-fowls to keep them from sinking, or to help them to swim;" that its use is the "quenching of the Spirit, and putting him as it were out of office," &c., &c.

The intensity of bitterness with which those old Puritans regarded the ceremonies of the Church, and the Liturgy in particular, may be seen in the sacrilege of which they were guilty in the time of the "Great Rebellion." Heylin thus describes the desecration of the Church of Chichester:

"By Waller's taking it the town got little, and the Church lost more; for upon Innocent's day, the soldiers forcibly broke into it, where they seized upon the vestments and ornaments of the Church, together with the consecrated plate serving for the Altar, not leaving so much as a cushion for the Pulpit, or a chalice for the blessed Sacrament. But this rich spoil being committed by the Marshal and other officers, the rest was left unto the hands and weapons of the common soldiers, who, with their pole-axes did not only break down the organs, but cut in pieces the Communion table with the rail before it. They defaced the two tables of the law at the east end of the quire, for fear they should rise up against them in the day of Judgment; most miserably made havoc of that Church's foundation, which they found on the one side of the south cross-ile portrayed in artificial manner, with the statues of the Kings of England, and coming to the portraiture of King Edward the sixth, they picked out his eyes, saying, in scorn, that all the mischief came from him in establishing the Book of Common Prayer. Which, that it might not be officiated as in former times, they broke open all the chests and cupboards, in which the quire-men had laid up their singing-books, Common-Prayer-Books, gowns and surplices, strewing the pavements of the Church with the leaves of the books, but turning the gowns and surplices into ready money. To all which acts of sacrilegious spoil and rapine, as Waller gave some countenance by his personal presence, and in that somewhat worse than Nero, as the story tells us; so Hazlerig gave much more by his voice and actions; for forcing his way into the chapter-house, he did not only command the soldiers to break down the wainscot, but seized on all the rich plate that belonged to the Church. And when it was desired they would leave one chalice only for the use of the Sacrament; answer was most profanely made by one of the Scots, (of which nation the two Houses employed too many,) that they might serve the turn with a wooden-dish."†

\* Cotton Mather's *Magnalia*, Vol. 2, Book IV, p. 41.

† Heylin's *History of the Presbyterians*, B. XIII, p. 451.



And the moderate Bishop HALL thus describes the scene at the noble old Church at Norwich:

"It is no other than tragical to relate the carriage of that furious sacrilege, whereof our eyes and ears were the sad witnesses, under the authority and presence of Linsey, [an Alderman,] and Tosts the Sheriff, and Greenwood. Lord, what work was here, what clattering of glasses, what beating down of walls, what tearing up of monuments and pulling down of seats, what wresting out of irons and brass from the windows and graves! what defacing of arms, what demolishing of curious stone work, that had not any representation in the world, but only of the cost of the founder, and skill of the mason! What tooting and piping upon the destroyed organ pipes, and what a hideous triumph on the market-day before all the country, when in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession, all the organ pipes, vestments, both copes and surplices, together with the leaden cross, which had newly been sawn down from over the green-yard pulpit, and the service books and singing books that could be had, were carried to the fire in the public market-place! A lewd wretch, walking before the train in his cope trailing in the dirt, with a service-book in his hand, imitating in impious scorn, the tune, and usurping the words of the Litany used formerly in the Church."<sup>\*</sup>

It will be remembered, too, that all this opposition was against the ceremonies of the Church, and them alone; and on account of these, they took the responsibility of separating from her. The doctrinal Formularies of the Church, they confessed to be according to Scripture, whatever might have been their own private interpretation of those Formularies.

The Puritans brought with them to this country the same inveterate hatred of the Prayer-Book. When, in Boston, in the time of Andross, President of the New England Colonies, a Church Clergyman first attempted to read the Burial Service over a grave, Haliburton says, "a crowd of persons, led on by an infuriated Deacon, drove him from the grave, and loaded him with insult and abuse, calling him 'Baal's priest,' and his prayers, 'leeks, garlies, and popish trash.'"<sup>†</sup>

Nor was this opposition to Liturgies confined to the early Puritans. If there is any one thing for which, more than another, we, as Churchmen, have been obliged to contend, it is the Scriptural authority, and the Christian edification of præscript Forms of Prayer. No longer ago than 1843, the "NEW ENGLANDER," the organ of New England Puritanism, came out, not only with a deliberate attack upon the "PRAYER-BOOK" in particular, but against Liturgies in general. It says, "we have many objections to a *stereotyped form* of prayer, as clogging the free aspirations of the soul, and as ill-suited to the varying exigencies of human life, which constantly arise!"

<sup>\*</sup> Bishop "Hall's Hard Measure," p. 63.

<sup>†</sup> Haliburton's "Rule and Misrule," p. 144.



"That a stereotyped form of prayer is contrary to inspired example," &c., &c.

And in 1849, this portion of New England was flooded with copies of a work from a Congregational Pastor, maintaining that Forms of Prayer are "unnecessary;" "are opposed to reason and common sense;" "are not sanctioned by the Scriptures, nor by the Church in her best days;" and that "they are injurious to piety," &c. And for the edification of its readers, they were gravely told that the "Clergyman of a certain Church, on being sent for to pray with a man who had the hydrophobia, refused to go, because there was no prayer in the Prayer-Book for a mad-dog's bite."

Of course it is delightful, after this long struggle of two centuries for a beautiful and Scriptural ceremonialism in the Worship of God, to witness the change which, within a few years, has come over the country. Possibly, our "Memorialists" may, after all, conclude that, in one respect, "our strength is to sit still." If the mountain will not come to Mahomet, Mahomet may perhaps think it a wise discretion to go to the mountain. There is, sometimes, "a masterly inactivity." And the Church may well have more faith in herself, if, indeed, she be, essentially, what CHRIST made her. But this, in passing. The forlorn looking Meeting House, graceless and meaningless, is giving place, in all our cities and large towns, to Gothic Temples, with their elaborate symbolism, their long-drawn Aisles, and fretted Arches, and Crosses, and Painted Windows, and Organs. In our last April Number, we took occasion to examine a carefully prepared Liturgy, provided for a large and respectable Christian denomination. And our readers will remember that in our January Number, 1857, we noticed a movement among the Presbyterians, looking to the restoration of Liturgical Worship in that large denomination; a movement, too, thoroughly endorsed by a leading Professor at Princeton. And if any of our readers would see a strong statement of the evils incident to an Extemporaneous Service, and of the necessity of Liturgical Worship, we commend them to "EUTAXIA," and to the Articles upon it, in the *Princeton* and the *Mercersburg* Reviews, both written by Presbyterians. But we confess that the Volume before us has taken us quite by surprise. That in Harvard University, the old fountain head of New England Puritanism, a new SERVICE BOOK should have been compiled, introduced, and, if reports are true, received with marked approbation, is a phenomenon for which we were not prepared.

Such a movement, so wide-spread, such changes in the whole



tone and temper of the public mind, have not been brought about without some adequate cause or causes. What are those causes, operating upon the common mind and feeling of the country generally, and especially operating in such a place as Harvard University? What has produced this new "Service Book?" To this question, doubtless, different answers will be given by different individuals. There is, however, in our judgment, a cause, lying much deeper than the surface, or rather a variety of causes, some of which we propose to name. The whole of these causes, or influences, may be described as having originated from one, and only one source. They have arisen out of the original, inherent, radical defects of the Puritan System. When Puritanism started as a System, the first thing which it did, was to cut itself loose, to sunder itself from everything—almost everything—back of itself. It had no past; and sought to have none. It rejected, at once, all the traditions of sixteen centuries. It retained, or professed to retain, indeed, the Written Word, but it gave to that Word its own private interpretation, and rejected, as Luther did, the Written Word where it did not agree with its own peculiar notions. All these Scriptures, of the Old Testament and the New, which tell us of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, are now, and ever have been to Puritanism, but oriental imagery, or a dead letter. Here was the first, great, seminal mistake of Puritanism.

It threw aside the Ministry, which CHRIST appointed through His Inspired Apostles, with the command to transmit that same Ministry which He had instituted, and with which He promised His presence unto the end of the world. It erected a Ministry of its own; by whom no Commission which Christ specially gave could possibly be claimed. For it was a man-made Ministry. It derived its commission and its authority not immediately from Christ, but immediately and directly from the people. This was one of its mistakes.

It threw aside the Creeds. This was an almost necessary consequence of having lost sight of the Church with its powers, functions, and duties. It forgot that the Church was the Witness, as well as the Keeper of Holy Writ; that the Faith was hers to preach, and spread, before a single Book of the New Testament had ever been written; that that Faith she had determined in all its essential Truths; had grouped, embodied, and published in a formula which is as old as Christianity itself. But Puritanism had no reverence and no obedience for a Faith so established, so witnessed, and so transmitted. Though that Symbol, the Apostles' Creed, contained every great FACT



in the Faith of CHRIST essential to salvation, yet it was too simple for the theorizing, system-making Puritans. Metaphysical speculations on Divine Sovereignty, Total Depravity, Limited Atonement, Unconditional Election, Effectual Calling, Saints Perseverance, Reprobation, Natural and Moral Ability, and such like *quiddities*, took the place of the Early Creeds, and were made matters of Faith. Here was another prime error of the old Puritans. For their system of Religion was built on a Philosophy; and that Philosophy was a human one, and so, liable to change. And when that Philosophy did change, as it has changed, their system of Religion went with it. They had Creeds and Confessions once; their Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms. But where are they now? Who believes them? Who profess to believe them? Who can be found capable of believing them? We might almost ask, who knows what they are; or cares what they are? These Confessions, as symbols of the Faith, have been frittered away, by lopping off a point here, and a point there, until they have become a string of vague, unmeaning generalities, signifying much, or little, or nothing, but deciding nothing, witnessing to nothing, and proving nothing, save the utter faithlessness of those who profess to hold them. And thus, the toast drank at a literary Festival at Harvard, some years since, was only literally true: "The Unitarians: the Anti-Sectarian Sect; whose Faith consists in not believing."

Here, as we said, was another radical mistake on the part of the early Puritans. Such a system of belief as they had adopted, if men could only be brought to embrace it, might make heroes of a certain type; and it did make them. For it was a complete system of its kind. It gave men an iron will. It taught men certain heroic virtues, of self-abnegation and unquestioning obedience. It gave to those stern old Puritans the moral force of the French Zouaves, or of a Russian Cohort, or of the Jesuit body. The only difficulty in the system was, that it was such an outrage on all human conceptions of Divine Goodness, and Love, and Justice, that men could not long believe it. Men felt that it was not Scriptural, and could not be true, and yet, as they had nothing else to fall back upon, they began, silently, but certainly, to drift away from all Creeds and Confessions; and Unitarianism, Universalism, and Deism have been the natural, necessary fruits. Indeed, the whole history of New England polemic divinity, of which all the country has heard, its *Edwardsism*, and *Emmonsism*, and *Taylorism*, and *Tylerism*, and *Bushnellism*, down to the very latest types of *Beecherism*, and *Parkerism*, the two most popular,



the best paying, and so, (according to modern ethics, which makes utility both the test of truth and the foundation of virtue,) the best theology; we say this whole, wide-sweeping range of *isms*, is one perpetual and natural protest of reason and consciousness, against the monstrous dogmas of metaphysical Puritan theology.

Nor is this all. Mere negation of belief can never meet the wants of our Spiritual nature. Men must have, and will have, Faith in something. And yet, all faith is founded on Belief. And all belief, to be the basis of faith, must rest on positive, objective Truth, or the semblance of such truth. And so, men having lost faith in God and CHRIST, and the Church, and the Catholic Symbols, tried for awhile, and are still trying, to have faith in themselves; faith in Humanity; faith in Socialism and Free-Loveism; faith in Spiritualism, &c., &c.; for, if their proud Reason cannot believe in such things as Sacraments, it can yet do homage to ghosts, and hobgoblins, and bend in awful reverence over the tippings of pine tables.

The Puritans made another mistake. Christianity became, in their estimation, wholly and intensely, a subjective thing. The Visible Body of CHRIST had become so corrupted, so overlaid and deformed with meretricious trappings and Romish accretions, that they determined to cut asunder the body and soul of religion entirely. This, with some qualifications, was the argument of John Calvin, in his plea for a Reformation before the Diet at Spire. The New England Puritans followed out that principle thoroughly. Many of them now began to doubt if there be a Visible Body of CHRIST at all, save as a mere figure of speech. They forgot that Christianity, as set up by its Author, is not a mere system of Doctrine, a scheme of abstract metaphysical truths, but an Institution, framed and fitted in all its parts to be obeyed, as well as believed; and adapted, to address and engross man's whole nature; to develop, train, and discipline, all his powers and susceptibilities; to lead man, with all his capacities and aspirations, up to CHRIST; and then, to be CHRIST's appointed Way to convey Christ's own blessings in all their fullness down from CHRIST to man. Hence, their system of Religion became a bald and naked thing. How that system led to an evisceration of the Sacraments, to an emptying of all their meaning, and to a conversion of them into a mere jejune, and dry, and barren ceremonialism, to which they still feel obliged to adhere, though they scarcely know why, we are not here called upon to show; though it is a most important topic of enquiry. But the feature of Puritanism, of which we are speaking, had this necessary effect. It led to



an undervaluing of everything which could throw beauty, and grace, and attractiveness around the public Worship and Service of God in His Holy Temple. The sentiments were not addressed. Half man's spiritual nature was left to withhold its homage from God, Who yet requires all the heart, and all the soul, and all the mind, and all the strength. The feeling of Reverence was not cultivated. An awful fear of God's Sovereignty was inculcated, but the idea of a loving, adoring Worship of a Being of Infinite perfection, was lost. Preaching took the place of Worship; and the reception of Truth, or rather of their metaphysical system, usurped the place of a living Faith in what God has revealed.

And here we have hit, as we suppose, in part at least, upon one of the originating causes of this "Service Book" now before us. It is the witness, the remonstrance, of feeling, and taste, and sentiment, of our whole æsthetic nature, against a bald, naked, frigid, informal *formalism*. There is an evident consciousness on the part of its compiler, as there is an implied confession, that there is and must be, some such thing as a union between the outward and the inward, the objective and the subjective, the body and the soul of religion; that God never meant that we should be angels in this world; but that He did mean we should be men; and that all our nobler powers, finer susceptibilities, and loftiest aspirations, should bring their offering and lay them upon the altar of His Worship. And with the growth, and the rapid growth too, of a love for the Beautiful in Nature and in Art, in our country, the influence of this feeling on religious ceremonialism is to be more predominant. For, men who have been taught to see, and feel, that God has made all nature around them, "beauty to the eye and music to the ear," can never be made to believe, that that same Being requires every finer sentiment of their nature to be outraged the moment they set foot within His Holy Temple.

Whether there be a far deeper meaning in this new "Service Book," and to what extent, whether there is in it a reaching after, and a grasping, more or less distinct, of those great Verities, the loss of which has proved the fatal bane of Puritanism, we cannot say. We hope and trust so. For, the present condition of Christianity in New England, and not least, in that portion of it represented by Harvard University, is no casual thing; it is the inevitable result of a certain fixed law, of cause and effect, which, slowly and silently, but surely, is developing itself. Truth, Faith, the Faith of Christ committed to His Church, spurned, ignored, superseded by man-made systems, will have its avenges, and at every sacrifice short of



itself. The foolishness of man shall never trifle with the wisdom of God with impunity: this is the fearful lesson of the history of New England Puritanism.

And before proceeding to examine this new Service Book, we wish to press this preliminary inquiry a little more closely. What is the meaning of this new movement at Harvard? What does it promise for the cause of CHRIST and the Church? What ought to be our position towards it in sympathy and feeling? Is it worthy of our confidence? Does it justify our hopes? There is, unquestionably, a great change going on in public sentiment throughout our whole country, originating from some cause or other. It is seen and felt by multitudes of thoughtful persons, that in that undefinable entity which passes as "our Common Christianity," there is something fundamentally wrong; that it is abnormal, fragmentary, chaotic, powerless. It is acknowledged, on all hands, that there are evils, great evils, growing out of this condition, which must be remedied before Christianity can become all-powerful for good, amid the growing distractions which now threaten utter ruin to our whole social organization.

We see proofs of this wide-spread conviction, in the abortive attempts to form what calls itself an "Evangelical Alliance;" and which, after all its sounding of trumpets, and marshaling of forces, still leaves its ranks scattered and broken as before. It is a Union without Unity, and without any possible basis of Unity. It is a Union of negations and protestations. It has nothing in it positive and vital; no strong and living bond binding the shattered fragments of protestantism together.

We see proofs of this change in public opinion, in the "Union Meetings," so called, of which, just now, so much is said. They are, to some extent, the involuntary and instinctive utterances of the Christian heart of multitudes, who seem to have felt, as if for the first time, that these disunited and antagonistic followers of the One Great Head, stand in a false position towards each other. And yet, in this movement, thus far, there has been much more of mere feeling and of impulse, than of sober deliberation, and cool judgment, and of desire to adjust real differences of opinion on great, vital principles of Truth, and of conscience.

We see evidence of the same sort, in some of the elements which have been gathered into the new Sect, calling itself the "Church of the Apostles," or, more popularly, the "Irvingites." Some of the leading spirits of that Sect are men who left the ranks of Congregationalism years ago, on principles which none can gainsay or resist. But in seeking shelter from the restless



agitations and strifes of Heresy and Schism, they mistook the true notes and marks of the One, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and adopted one of their own devising. They have attempted to *create* an Apostolate, to meet a fancied emergency; not remembering, that the Church of nineteen centuries is itself built upon the "foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST Himself being the chief Corner Stone;" and that "the wall of the city had Twelve foundations, and in them the names of the Twelve Apostles of the Lamb."

They forget that the Apostles, in the persons of their Successors, always have been in the Church, are now in the Church, and always will be in the Church, until the end of time. So it is, and must be; or else the promise of JESUS CHRIST is made of none effect—"LO, I AM WITH YOU ALWAYS, EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD." We show the line of that Succession in all ages from the Apostles until now. There is no such emergency, as these men claim; none, save in the want of faith, and love, and of submission to the ordinances which CHRIST hath ordained. And yet, we are told that the Apostles, Angels and Bishops, whom CHRIST hath appointed, are to bow down in subjection to the "apostles," "angels," and "bishops," whom these men have set up! The sun, and moon, and lesser lights of heaven, are to gather around their little farthing candle, as a centre of unity!! We have seen their pretensions, and we have heard their claims, and what are they? Have they such gifts of Miracles, as vouch for their stupendous professions? as to prove that the Church has been in a state of orphanage, and that CHRIST's promises have been a lie, even until the advent of these men? The only warrant of their mission, which we have chanced to witness, is a certain air of authority, and a certain method of argument, precisely like that which characterized the "missionaries" of the "Latter-day-Saints," who, twenty years ago, used to stroll two-and-two, about the country. The only Centre of Unity which the Church knows, or needs, is the "ONE LORD" JESUS CHRIST, Who, still, the GOD-MAN, presides over the destiny of His Church; the One Faith; the One Baptism; the One God and Father of all; and the oneness of that Apostolate, as a bond and symbol of Unity, which has been transmitted in the Church. To demand more than this—and there has always been a tendency, when the Faith of the Church was weak, to demand more—is to transcend the wisdom of CHRIST, Who declared that His Kingdom is not of this world. We have dwelt, perhaps, too long upon this illustration of the point before us; but it has been because the whole movement,



which we have traced, is another important witness to a growing conviction as to the inherent weakness of the popular Christianity of the day.

We see proofs of this same movement, in the return to Liturgical Worship, on the part of various Christian bodies, to which we have already alluded. The book before us is, of course, a proof looking in the same direction. For many years, it has been known that there was a spirit of deep dissatisfaction in Boston and its vicinity, among many thoughtful men, with their present position. They seem to have discovered that Unitarianism, for some cause, was not true to their own hearts. They yearned for the true Bread from Heaven, and it had only fed them on husks. They felt in their souls the disorder which sin had caused, the estrangement from God, which it had effected; and they felt, too, that Unitarianism could tell them of no "Days-man betwixt us, That might lay His hand upon us both." They saw, too, the downward tendencies of the system all about them; the wreck of all true Faith, in the multitudes, of young and old, who hang, from week to week, upon the lips of the bold blasphemer. These startling realities have apparently alarmed them; and we learn, from various sources, that in many a house of Unitarian Worship, in the neighborhood of Boston, a change has been quietly going on for the last few years of the most significant character.

This change, too, strange as it may seem, has originated, apparently, wholly within the Unitarians themselves. The Church, alas! alas! the Church, which ought to be the bright polar star to such a movement—which ought to ring out those clear clarion tones of a trumpet which giveth no "uncertain sound," in such a day as this, tones which woke an echo in the hearts of the faithful in the days of good old St. Ambrose, when Milan itself was only another Boston; the Church, we say, where we had a right to look for such a demonstration of her strength, has been merely a cold, unappreciating, unsympathizing looker on, and has "passed by on the other side." For, what has she done, and *what is she doing*, to foster and guide a spirit thirsting for another and truer System of Faith and Worship than that which the old Puritans, in their pride and self-will, adopted, and of which their descendants are now eating the bitter fruits? Thank God, there is a feeling in the Church, growing and strengthening every day, which can appreciate such a spirit, which can sympathize with it, and which, in its own working life and energy, is giving full proof that it is deserving of confidence in the great work which CHRIST has left His Church to do.



We need not say, what we have already more than intimated, that we look hopefully upon this movement at Harvard and throughout the country. It is a token for good. God is in the movement, and He will overrule it to His glory and the good of His Church. To what extent there is, in the public mind, such a chastening of Human Reason as to adopt the good old rule of St. Anselm, *Neque enim quaero intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam*, we cannot say; but to this rule CHRIST's disciples must ultimately come; for, rightly guarded, it is the guide to all true Christian knowledge. Nor are our feelings those of a mere partisan; the rejoicings of a rival sectism, which exults over the downfall of an opposing party, and the temporary advantage which its own clique or clan may boast. God forbid. Whatever may be the effect of this change in public sentiment on the Protestant Episcopal Church, we would desire, most of all, to know, whether the ground-work of this whole movement, and its inciting cause, is an apprehension of those great Catholic Verities which must underlie all true reform, and all real advancement, in the professed family of CHRIST.

In the face of this wide-spread, this deep and earnest spirit of enquiry which comes up from all parts of Christendom, such as, we solemnly believe, has not been heard before since the Apostolic days, the Church of Rome is not a silent or uninterested observer. She hopes, and evidently seeks, to regain the ground which, three centuries ago, she lost; and is trimming every sail with that intent. But can she meet that spirit of enquiry? Can she satisfy it? Not unlikely, amid the rush of wide extremes, here and there a mind, restless, reckless, ill-balanced, may be dazzled by her theories, captivated by her fallacies, or confounded by her pretensions. But the deep-felt want in the heart of so large a part of Christendom, she can never fill. She has drifted, and is still drifting, so far from the old moorings; she is, confessedly, so unlike what the Church was when CHRIST and the Inspired Apostles laid her Foundations, in Doctrine, Discipline, Worship and temper, that such men as Newman and Brownson are compelled to give up Holy Scripture as interpreted by the Fathers; while they are utterly at loggerheads with each other as to what shall be put in their place. Newman's infidel Theory of Development is as obnoxious to Brownson, as Brownson's theory of Authority is outrageous in the sight of Newman. Her Trentine Heresies and novelties; her recent form of gross and groveling Idolatry, which her Popes and better Doctors had again and again rejected; her teaching on the nature of Sacrifice, and of the



One Great Sacrifice of the Cross; her fundamental error as to the very nature of personal religion; the whole genius and spirit of the system, at war with humanity and with all true progress—to all this, intelligent Christians, with God's Word in their hands, will never come, otherwise than with utter loathing and abhorrence. Ultra-Protestantism may be bad enough; but Ultra-Montanism would be a doubtful relief.

And here, we cannot but advert, and not for the first time, to the position which our own branch of the Church has lately taken on this whole subject of Christian Union. What she has done, and all that she has done, is to bear witness to the great truth of the Unity of CHRIST's Body; and to express her readiness to meet the question, What are those essentials of a True Catholicity which must form the basis of Christian Union? There are things, which belong to the very essence of such a Catholicity. There are things, which are only the accidents of that Catholicity. And yet, these accidents are binding on the conscience of those who have promised to observe them; and are not, therefore, to be thrown off, and evaded, at the mere whim and caprice of individual self-will. And still they are only accidents, and not essentials, of the true Faith of Christ.

And in this truly Catholic and Christian spirit we would desire to meet the significant changes which now greet us from our neighboring University, and the country at large. So far as there is a going back, beyond the Pilgrim Fathers, beyond the English and Continental Reformers, to Primitive and Apostolic Standards, of the Faith of Christ, and of the Doctrines, Ministry, Worship, and Discipline of the Church, so far we have a right to rejoice. But, so far as there is in this movement a mere eclecticism, a mere work of temporary expediency, a mere system of empiricism, to meet an emergency, a mere choice of Liturgies and of deeper Doctrines, because, at the worst, there is nothing to lose; so far the whole movement lacks faith, and vitality, and will assuredly come to naught. So far, also, as there is in this movement the promptings of a merely æsthetic culture, a love for the Beautiful in Religion, a craving to put on that "clothing" which is "of wrought gold," and all for its own sake; so far, also, the whole movement will prove utterly in vain. There is, we doubt not, at Harvard, and at Boston, such an entire cutting loose from traditional Puritanism as to make such innovations in those old Puritan shrines, without hesitation. But our hope, and our belief is, that there is, at the bottom of all this work, so much of heart and soul, so much of principle, and of sympathy with the true Faith of CHRIST in all ages, as that by it CHRIST's Name is to be honored, and His Blessed Kingdom advanced.



This "SERVICE BOOK FOR PUBLIC WORSHIP" is to us more deserving of attention, as an adoption of the principle of Liturgical Worship, than for the materials, or the structure, of the Service itself; though these, in various aspects, possess very great interest. One defect in the work is, that it does not furnish a complete Form of Devotion, or an entire Service arranged in order, for any one occasion of Public Worship. It has Forms out of which such a Service may be selected; but one great advantage of a Liturgical Worship is, that the Forms are already perfectly known, and that the worshiper has nothing to do but throw his heart and soul into an offering of Prayer and Praise, the very words of which he is already familiar with. Nothing should be left to the discretion, and so, to the indiscretion, of him who ministers at the altar. The Preface to the work is as follows:

"The object of this Service-Book is to make our public worship more interesting, more reverential, more various, more congregational, and more effectual in promoting the sacred purposes for which the worship is offered.

"It is believed that the designed manner of using it will be understood, on a little attention to the contents, without explanation. Though the circumstances have required a considerable deviation from the 'Book of Common Prayer,' that is recognized as the most complete body of liturgical exercises in our language. No entire service, for a day or season of devotion, is found arranged in order.

"That arrangement is left to the liberty and choice of the minister or the congregation. By way of suggestion, an 'Order' is given on the page next after the table of Contents.

"The passages intended to be given as responses to the minister, by the congregation, or by the choir, or by both together, as may be found expedient in different cases—including always the *Amen*—are printed in italics.

"In the lessons from the Holy Scriptures, the passages and sentences are not always presented entire, as they occur in the Bible. It has only been endeavored to offer services in Scriptural language, with no such alterations or omissions as would materially affect the original meaning.

"For convenience, the term 'Prophecies' is used in an extended but not unauthorized sense, and is applied to any parts of Scripture which convey 'praise' or religious instruction in any elevated forms of expression."

"Cambridge, October, 1858."

The following is the table of Contents of the entire volume:  
Sentences of Introduction; Exhortation and Confession;  
General Confession; The Commandments; Beatitudes; Services for the Christian Year; Feasts of the Church; Movable Feasts; Fasts of the Church; Collects for Special Days; Service for Christmas; Service for a Day of Thanksgiving; Service for a Day of Fasting; Service for National Anniversary; Service for the Communion of the Lord's Supper; Service for Baptism; Covenant of the Church in Harvard University; The Apostles' Creed; Te Deum; Litany; Scriptural Litanies; Special Prayers; Sentences of Benediction.

We have also a Table giving a "Regular Order" for a



Service on an ordinary occasion of Public Worship, which will give a pretty good idea of this Liturgy in actual use.

1st. Introductory Sentences. (*Congregation sit.*) These Sentences are mostly hortatory, and are very numerous, covering nearly four closely printed pages.

2d. The Exhortation and Confession; or, the General Confession. (*Congregation sit, bowing the head, or kneel.*) The Exhortation is our own. The Confession (which is to be said by the minister and congregation together) is the same with ours; with two notable omissions; the words, "And there is no health in us;" and, in the last petition, the words, "for his sake," are left out.

3d. The Lord's Prayer. (*Congregation sit, bowing the head, or kneel.*)

4th. A Chant or Anthem. (*Congregation stand.*)

5th. The Beatitudes, or Commandments. At discretion. (*Congregation sit.*) The Beatitudes are to be said responsively. There are also responses at the conclusion of the Commandments.

6th. Collect and Prophecies for the Day. (*Congregation sit.*) These Collects are arranged for an entire Ecclesiastical Year. The Collects are mostly those of our own Prayer Book; but with some verbal alterations; and with some important modifications to adapt them to a Unitarian Chapel. Thus, in the Collect for the Third Sunday in Advent; our own Collect, which begins, "Oh LORD JESUS CHRIST, who at thy first coming didst send thy messenger to prepare thy way before Thee," &c., is altered, so as to read, "Oh God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who at his first coming didst send a messenger to prepare his way before him, grant," &c. And here we have the key to nearly all the changes made in those portions of our Prayer Book which have been adopted. There is no Collect for, or mention made of, Trinity Sunday; and the Sundays in that portion of the year are named after Whitsunday. The "Prophecies" are to be said responsively.

7th. Hymn. (*In singing, congregation stand.*)

8th. Prayer, by the Minister, or selected. (*Congregation sit, bowing the head, or kneel.*) In the collection of Prayers for ordinary Worship, the work is specially defective, and here is one of the weak points of the book.

9th. Reading from the New Testament, or from one of the Historical Books of the Old Testament. (*Congregation sit.*) And here again, there is no Table of Lessons, and the Minister is left to his own discretion, and he may, or may not, select Scripture



in harmony with the Ecclesiastical Year. This is another weak point of the book, though easily remedied.

10th. Hymn. (*In singing, congregation stand.*)

11th. Litany, or Special Prayers, or both. (*Congregation sit, bowing the head, or kneel.*) The Litany is essentially that in our Prayer Book, with the exception that the invocations of the Son, and of the HOLY GHOST, and of the TRINITY, are all omitted.

12th. Psalms for the Day. (*Congregation sit.*) These portions of the Psalter are not taken continuously, as in the Prayer Book, but are selected from the Common Version, and are to be said responsively.

13th. TE DEUM, or Anthem, or Chant. (*Congregation stand.*) And here, again, that glorious old "TE DEUM," which has wafted to the Throne of God the prayers of myriads of Saints, in all ages, has been tampered with. Those sublime, soul-stirring invocations of the Son, beginning: "Thou art the King of Glory, Oh Christ," are made to stand thus:

Thou art the King of Glory, Oh Lord;

And Jesus Christ is Thy well-beloved Son, &c.

We enter into no argument over such trifling. We only record our feelings of mingled sorrow and amazement, and beg to say, spare that jubilant song of the Church; let it stand, as it has stood through the ages all along; or let it alone.

14th. Benediction. (*Congregation stand.*)

The compiler adds in a Note: "Could a general rule for postures be followed, a proper correspondence between the attitude and the act would seem to require the worshipers to stand in praise or singing, to sit in instruction, or reading, and to kneel, or bow, in confession and prayer."

The Service for the Communion of the LORD'S SUPPER is principally from the old Liturgy of St. James; and is that compiled and translated for a Service Book, by Rev. F. H. Hedge, D. D. It is rich as far as it goes; but it fails in that fullness of apprehension and teaching, which makes that Blessed Sacrament so full of comfort and of blessing to the penitent and devout soul.

The Service for Baptism is still more meagre. The nature of the Sacrament is not set forth in it. And yet the Baptismal Formula is, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

This Baptism, as it is in the name of the Three Persons of the Trinity, might be pronounced a valid Baptism, except that there is no profession of Repentance and renunciation of sin, and of Faith in Christ, on the part of the subject of the Bap-



tism. In this respect the Service is singularly incoherent ; for the opening sentences of Scripture in the Exhortation, are full of that great, and yet mysterious truth, that stumbling block to the proud rationalism of New England theology ; a truth, too, ignored, we grieve to say, in so much of our popular Church teaching, to wit : that we are baptized into the Death of Christ, and so, in virtue of our Baptism, made heirs to all the glories of His Resurrection. This real union with Christ, so strengthening in life, so cheering in death, so full of consolation as we stand around the graves of our hopes and affections, is of course not brought out fully and prominently in the Baptismal Service before us ; yet it is recognized, as we said, in the selections taken from the old Baptismal Offices. In this respect, the whole Service Book before us is a curiosity. The fragrance of these old Catholic truths, broken and fragmentary though they are, greets us everywhere in the volume. A dead letter, they may seem to many of the Unitarians who use them ; but the Spirit Who quickeneth, may open up through them perceptions of great Verities for which their souls are already thirsting, though they know it not.

We have said enough of this new "Service Book" to indicate its character. Of course, the true Faith of the Gospel, as it has been held in the Catholic Church, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus, creditum erat*, we had no right to look for, in its fullness, in a Liturgy prepared for use in the Chapel of a Unitarian University. Yet we are glad to see, that there is there, a depth of culture, a purity of taste, a freedom from narrow prejudice, which has enabled Dr. Huntington to draw so much from the old fountains of Liturgical Worship in the best ages of the Church. In this respect, this new "Service Book" is vastly superior to the new "German Reformed Liturgy" which we examined in a late number of our Review. Much as there is in it which strikes us unpleasantly, and to a degree which its compiler possibly will fail to appreciate, we yet cannot but hail with fervent gratitude a movement in the right direction, and in itself so full of promise.



ART. VII.—LETTER TO THE EDITOR: BISHOPS, SUCCESSORS  
OF THE APOSTLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHURCH REVIEW:—

REV. SIR:—It has been the custom of many of your contributors to speak of the Bishops of the Universal Church, as the Successors of the Apostles; and on more than one occasion I have seen this form of expression severely criticised. In almost all cases, where it has been so criticised, the distinct assertion has been made, that this doctrine, or idea—for some apply to it the one appellation, and some the other—was introduced into the Church of England by Archbishop Laud and the Divines who sympathized with him, and is not to be found in writers of an earlier date. This raises, of course, an historical question, which can only be settled by an appeal to the facts of history. Such an appeal I now propose, with your permission, to lay before your readers.

The first thing to be done is, to settle the precise period, before which it is alleged this form of expression does not appear. Now I have no objection to assuming Archbishop Laud's birth as that period. But, inasmuch as I suppose it will hardly be asserted that he became the founder of a School in Theology, so soon as he was born, it will be better to assume as the date in question, the year 1602, when he read his first Divinity lecture at Oxford, and first came prominently before the Church. It then becomes a simple question of fact, whether or no, before that time, before Laud was known, or could have exercised any influence, writers of standing and authority in the Church of England, were in the habit of speaking of Bishops as Successors of the Apostles.

1. RICHARD HOOKER, in the VIIth Book of his Polity, Chapter IV, Sec. 3, says: "The Apostles gave episcopal authority, and that to continue always with them that had it. . . . The Apostles, therefore, were the first which had such authority, and all others who have it after them in orderly sort, are *their lawful successors*." It is worthy of note, that the special antagonist to whom he refers in this place as denying that the Apostles had any successors, is Stapleton the Papist, and not Cartwright the Puritan.

Again, in Book V, Sec. 54, he says: "It clearly appeareth that churches apostolic did know but three degrees in the power



of ecclesiastical order. At the first, Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons; *afterwards instead of Apostles, Bishops.*" Other passages might be quoted, but let these suffice.

2. HADRIAN SARAVIA put forth, in 1590, under the direction and patronage of Archbishop Whitgift, a treatise on the Ministry, in which he takes identically the same ground.

It was in Saravia's time, that the plea of *necessity* for giving up the Succession in Bishops, was first exchanged for a defense of that step *on principle*; and this greatly influenced Saravia, and others after him, like Grabe, in seeking refuge in the English Church.

3. BISHOP BILSON published his celebrated Treatise on the Perpetual Government of Christ's Church, (he being then Warden of Winchester College,) in 1593. In the Epistle to the reader, he says: "From the Apostles to the first Nicene Council, and so along to this our age, there have always been selected some of greater gifts than the residue, to *succeed in the Apostles' places*, to whom it belonged both to moderate the Presbyters of each Church, and to take the special charge of imposition of hands; and this *their singularity* in succeeding, and superiority in ordaining, have been observed from the Apostles' times, as the peculiar and substantial marks of *Episcopal power and calling*." The whole of his XIIIth Chapter is devoted to the proof and maintenance of this position.

To all this, it may, perhaps, be replied, that these references are to works published after Bancroft's celebrated "Sermon at Paul's Cross," and the libels of Martin Mar-Prelate; at which time some people are fond of saying the idea in question was first broached. At all events, the *Laudian* origin of the view is disproved. But I am not yet done with our authorities.

4. In the month of March, 1559, the first year of Queen Elizabeth, occurred the well known Conference of the eight Romish and eight Reforming Divines, at Westminster. The second of the three subjects proposed for discussion was this: "Every Church hath authority to appoint, take away, and change ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, so the same be done to edification." The Romish Divines dodged the question; and refused to argue it. The Reforming Divines, however, had prepared a paper, which has been preserved. In it occurs this passage: "*The Apostles' successors* had the same authority that the Apostles had. For that the adversaries grant. . . . But *all Bishops be the Apostles' successors*, as appeareth by St. Hierome," &c. Now this I take to be not only a clear, but a very solemn enunciation of opinion, made deliberately, in a written document, and in an important Conference. And who



made it? Who set their hands to it? SCORY, Bishop of Chichester in Edwards' time, an exile under Mary, one of Parker's consecrators, and Bishop of Hereford; WHITEHEAD, an exile under Mary; JEWELL; AYLMER, Bishop of London; Cox, Bishop of Ely; GRINDAL; HORNE, Bishop of Winchester; and GUEST, Bishop of Rochester and afterwards of Salisbury. I do not mean to be understood as saying that any of these Divines, except Scory, were Bishops at this Conference; of two of their number it is enough to give their names; while none of them are obscure or undistinguished. And yet they speak of Bishops as the Successors of the Apostles, as if it were an admitted thing and a familiar idea among them, fourteen years before Archbishop Laud was born, and forty years before he could have begun to exercise any influence on the English Church.

I submit, Sir, whether, in view of all these facts, those who persistently assert that your correspondents in speaking of Bishops as Successors of the Apostles, are using a form of expression unknown to the earlier Divines of the Reformed English Church, are not themselves exhibiting either a very remarkable ignorance, or a degree of moral hardihood, which would, probably, in the affairs of every day life, receive a much shorter appellation.

I am, Rev. Sir,

Very respectfully your Servant,

---



ART. VIII.—A WORD FOR OUR FATHERS, IN A LETTER TO  
AN ENGLISH LAYMAN.

MY DEAR SIR:

It is now more than a year since we were first agitated by the unhappy words concerning the American Church, which Dr. Pusey thought good to introduce into his work on Church Councils. That work has brought out several admirable replies,\* which I herewith send, and beg you to do me the favor of reading. I regret that none of them have been published in England, and that the writer in the *Guardian*, who briefly reviewed the learned Article in the CHURCH REVIEW of April last, did so, apparently, without reading the Article; certainly, without any candid estimate of its weight and importance, as evidence of the very superficial view of ancient precedents taken by the learned and estimable author of the work in question. This is hard usage, considering the consequence attached by many to the opinions of the venerable Regius Professor. Hundreds have read the grave charges, who will never know anything of the replies. It is easy to say that we are too sensitive, and make a great ado about a little matter. But, if we were not sensitive to a charge of constructive heresy, we might justly be reproached as dead to a sense of the vital importance of orthodoxy. Besides, we are contending, here in America, against great odds, and if we be robbed of that sympathy and support which is to be derived from the feeling that you are heartily with us, it will, indeed, be to us, "as when a standard-bearer fainteth." I long to know that you, at least, with others who have taken an interest in our affairs, are in possession of the facts; and while I send you these able papers as our justification, there are some additional views of the matter, which I beg to present, chiefly as an apology for our good and wise forefathers, of the Synod of 1789. Dr. Pusey has written a letter to one of our newspapers, assuring us that he feels a lively interest in our Church, and not a word which I shall add is written in any other spirit than that of the most cordial acknowledgment of his good-will.

Now, I do not say that it has been shown that our Bishops

---

\* See "Church Review," January and April, 1858; and "Church Monthly," Articles by H. D. E., 1858.



can do all that they ought to do, as successors of the Apostles ; but I do maintain that there are no Bishops in Western Christendom, unless it be those of Scotland, who are less restricted. Among the rights and prerogatives of Bishops, one would suppose, should be that of calling any of the faithful to assist in counsel and legislation—provided, in their judgment, such counsel and assistance might be for the good of the Church. Such was the plenitude of their powers, of old, that they did sometimes send laymen into pulpits to exhort and interpret, by their authority, as in the case of Origen. This case is confessedly an extreme one, and yet it was not without precedent. But allowing our Church to be all that has been suggested, it does not appear that we owe it to lay influence, or to anything connected therewith. Far otherwise, for unhappily, the weakness of our first Councils was in the Upper House. One of our early Bishops is said to have been a drag upon all genuine Church legislation, rendering himself troublesome alike to Bishops Seabury and White, who were the real exponents of the two Schools of American Theology then, as now, predominating. Besides, on the principle assumed by the Doctor to be the true and Catholic one, there should have been a marked decline, from that day to this, in the legislation of the Church, as touching all matters, whether of Doctrine or Discipline ; but just the reverse has been the case ; a healthful progress being always visible in the action of our Synods down to the very last one, in which the Constitutional provision was finally adopted, excluding from Synods all Laymen not actually in full communion. It will be unanimously conceded by our Bishops, and others acquainted with the proceedings of our Synods, that our Laity have, at all times, proved themselves a most conservative party, and that if they have ever hindered important legislation, such hindrance has been a wholesome check on hasty and premature movements. If in the first Synod, that of 1789, or subsequently, we have ever “lowered the faith,” or “suppressed the truth,” the blame cannot be laid on the Laity, and the Doctor’s line of argument is not the gainer. It is on this account that I deprecate the attack upon our Orthodoxy, by which the argument was made, apparently, so strong. In point of fact, the attack was purely gratuitous, if otherwise not unjust. It might have proved that our Bishops were unfaithful to their trust, but unless it can be shown that their conduct was influenced by the Laity, it proves nothing against these lay-assistants in Council. There is no propriety, therefore, in the line of argument which has been adopted, so far as we are concerned ; for either less should have been said,



or more should have been proved. As it is, just enough has been advanced to beget uneasiness, and to awaken suspicions, if not to "sow discord among brethren." The time chosen for the insertion of such a wedge between the two Churches, appears to me, moreover, especially inopportune. If ever there was need of "strengthening what remains" of Christian unity, and of knitting more and more closely the cords of love between those Churches to which Christ has given not only the Unity of the spirit, but the bond of peace, it seems to me that time is now. An immense work is, at this moment, opening to the Christians of England and America, and it is all important, so far as we can see, that a good understanding should exist, and be fortified, between the Apostolic Churches of the two empires, if that work is to be carried on in a Catholic and Apostolic way.

I freely acknowledge that truth must be spoken, whatever may be the consequences, and that no alliance can develop strength, which is based on the surrender of any essential verity, or Catholic principle. It is, with some hesitation, conceded, however, by the learned author, that the American Church is not actually involved in any formal heresy, or act of schism: If this be so, (and I think it almost needless to say that the author's caution in acknowledging it, is the first hint we have ever yet received of our perilous position,) would it not have been the part of charity to "think no evil," and to show more of the spirit which beareth all things and believeth all things? We, at any rate, must try to show something of the same spirit, which "is not easily provoked."

I assure you, then, that it is not in the feeling of an aggrieved *amour propre*, that I invite your earnest consideration to the subject. It is in the hope that any rising misunderstanding may be prevented, and further evil allayed. We are surrounded by malicious adversaries. Puritan and Papist alike would exult over a breach between the Anglo-Catholics of England and America. The popular spirit that lately exhibited itself at Berlin, bears a grudge to the Unity which already exists, and hates to see it growing nearer and dearer. It is the rebuke of all false and unreal alliances, and it furnishes to Christendom a testimony to the Ancient and Apostolic idea of the Oneness of Catholics. Who, then, among us, but must grieve to see the enemy's work done for him by those within our pale? If the feeling engendered by this assault, in the minds of some, is not speedily suppressed, it will prove "the letting out of water," and "the beginning of strife," in which nobody can find cause to exult, but "those who have evil will at Sion."



I will not permit myself to believe that one who, as we have commonly been told, habitually calls all that profess the true Faith of Christ, to "love one another," is at all aware of what he has done, or of what he has endangered. But I am deeply pained for the noble opportunity he has lost of doing us good. For a learned work, on a subject of the greatest practical importance, we are all indebted to him. For the frank expression of his conscientious convictions, I honor him; but his hasty accusations of his brethren, I greatly lament. Had he only invited us, in temperate language, to reflect upon his argument, and to consider well our own position as affected by it; had he lamented our loss of the glorious Athanasian Symbol, and asked us whether this privation might not have been the consequence, or the natural accompaniment, of taking the Laity as counselors; or, had he, fraternally, suggested his fears that such might be found to be the fact; I, for one, should have considered him a benefactor. In all things, we require a friendly antagonism to correct us if we are mistaken, or to confirm us if we are right. In his noble eulogy of the *Quicumque vult*, I not only concur, but I feel my enthusiasm kindled as I read his glowing language. Surely he might have spared us the damper of the context. In that case, his words would have done good, and stimulated us to a more complete attainment of the full stature of the perfect man in Christ. As it is, I dread the contrary effect. The bitter and provoking accusations which follow, are far from what are commonly understood as "speaking the truth in love." I cannot discover in anything that is spoken, nor even in his apparent sympathy and commiseration, "the faithful wounds of a friend."

It must be confessed that if any one is anxious to make out a case against us, there is much that may be said with apparent force. The Preface of our Prayer Book bespeaks for it the consideration of all sincere Christians, "without prejudice or prepossessions, and with a meek, candid, and charitable frame of mind." It is only with persons of such a disposition that I can hope to succeed in showing, briefly, that whatever our defects may be, we have not "suppressed the truth," done violence to any essential function of the Episcopate, nor rendered ourselves too unhealthy to be embraced, in brotherly love, by our sister Churches, to say nothing of the love that ought to be maternal, and full of the milk of Christian kindness.

It certainly will be allowed by all, that our Bishops, by a function of their Office, might, with perfect right, have taken upon themselves the composition of an original Liturgy, for the National Church of America. In "setting in order the things



that were wanting," they had a right, moreover, to set forth the Eucharistic Office, which they have done, as THE LITURGY of their Church; compiling an office for Daily Prayer entirely anew, or out of the ancient material, if you will, of the Breviary itself. Or, they had a right to revert to Greek originals in which there is no *Quicunque vult*, and not a word of complaint could have proceeded, with justice, from any Bishop or Doctor in Christendom. No one will deny this, theoretically; and yet because every feeling of filial love led our Bishops and the whole Church to prefer the formularies of our Anglican Mother as the natural basis of the American Daily Offices, and because, while so doing they actually reverted in one particular to the example and authority of the Greeks, as in others to early Anglican, and even Latin originals, they are assailed as guilty of "suppressing truth," and, all but, as departing from the Faith. The Vatican itself allows more liberty. Look at the diversity of rites and of Liturgies which Rome tolerates, in the East and West, and even in Italy, where the Ambrosian Church maintains so large a degree of independence. I know the Pope has lately crushed the beautiful Gallican Liturgy, but certainly with a want, not only of taste, but of justice and charity, which is not to be imitated. In fact this variety in unity, so coincident with what we observe in nature, is a necessary characteristic of Catholicity, in its exhaustless wealth of material, and its infinite adaptability to the various dispositions, wants and circumstances of men. No barren identity, no dull uniformity supplies a note of Apostolic origin. As in a large and loving family we seek the parental features and characters, not in the ludicrous similarity which is so often reproduced when the parental models are homely or deformed, but in modified and composite forms of loveliness:—

———"facies non omnibus una,  
Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororum."

Granting, then, that our Daily Offices are impoverished, this is a very small consideration, while our Liturgy proper is even enriched. It is invidious to compare ourselves with others, and we are far from ambitious of being considered quite as lovely as our Mother; but we think we may without self-conceit declare that if not beautiful, we are yet whole; and that if in some things we have lost since we were made independent, we are yet gainers in other respects. Our Daily Offices, like those of the Orientals, lack the Athanasian Hymn, and this is deplorable; but then, on the other hand, our Eucharistic rite retains the Oblation and the Invocation, in its Canon.



If we be less happy in the composition of our Synods, we are at least free to celebrate them; and admitting lay-interference to be our common misfortune, we are happy that it affects us only in an orderly and regulated form, and that those laymen who are permitted to consult with us, as touching matters Ecclesiastical, are all faithful men, and unable at worst, to do anything without the free consent of their Bishops and the Clergy.

What, then, is the *gravamen* of our author? In what are we so unworthy of being loved and trusted by our brethren? What need is there of a solemn warning against closer relations with us? Do we not hold all the definitions which the Catholic Church has ever set forth as tests of Unity in Faith? Does not our Eighth Article acknowledge the Nicene Creed, and are not the first Five Articles a sufficient testimony that we are neither Nestorians nor Eutychians, nor anything else which the Four Councils, not to say the Six, have condemned? May it not fairly be said that we, at this moment, profess all the Articles of the Athanasian Creed? And though we do not sing it in our Churches, have we not bound it "as a frontlet between our eyes," in the declaration we have made, from the beginning, that we depart, in *nothing*, from the essential doctrine of our Mother Church—nay, that we are *far* from any such departure? Surely until this declaration is changed, or till the Church of England changes, our doctrine must be regarded as one and the same. I do not suppose any one will roundly accuse us of "paltering in a double sense," in the use of the word *essential*. It was used to guard against the suspicion that we held the *non-essential* doctrine of the King's supremacy: certainly not to exclude one iota of anything which the Church of England has declared. "proven by certain warrants of Holy Scripture," and hence—*omnino recipiendum et credendum*—"thoroughly to be received and believed." On the basis of this assurance, and of other things which we expressly assent unto, we, at least, have always supposed ourselves to be Athanasians; and such being our formal *status*, as to the Faith once delivered to the Saints, it is only justice to say that the great truths of that Symbol have been as faithfully witnessed and contended for, during the last half century, by our Bishops and Clergy, as they ever were. It is not less true, that the great Apostolic principles of the Succession, and of the Catholic Fellowship, have been for a century maintained by the same confessors, with a degree of fidelity only surpassed by those who, in the primitive ages, were actually burned at the stake, or thrown to the lions. As the descendant of one of them,



who twice crossed the Atlantic for the gift of Holy Orders, and endured many things to fulfill his missionary course, I speak with feeling, but I speak only truth.

But it is imagined that we are dangerous *innovators* in matters of discipline. Certain it is that we have always understood the function of Bishops to be just what Dr. Pusey asserts, and that we never dreamed of compromising it, when we closely copied our Mother Church, and departed from her mode of lay-coöperation only so far "as local circumstances seemed to require." The Bishops, according to Dr. Pusey, are a full Synod, by themselves, with special promise of the Presence of the HOLY GHOST. We admit it, and show you such a Synod, in the Upper House of our General Convention. Stripped of modern terms, we may point to them as meeting every requisition of the learned author's book. With them rests the full power to bear any testimony, or start any measure which they deem important. On doctrinal matters, they can embody their teachings in a Pastoral Letter, and order it to be read in all the Churches, and the Laity cannot hinder them in such a measure, whether in Synod or elsewhere. The Upper House of Convocation in England is not half so free or so potent as they are, for that is sore let and hindered by the Crown.

I am not showing that our Bishops find no impediments, but I am going on to show that apart from the interference of the Sovereign, in which our Episcopal Synod has the advantage, they have the very same restraints, and none others, which the English Bishops have. Let the English Bishops act; then comes the power of the Lower House, to which corresponds precisely that of our Clerical Deputies. Let these two estates act together, then comes the power of the Laity in Parliament, to which corresponds that of our Laity in Convention. Can the English Bishops make a law of the Church without the concurrence of these coefficients? The *gravamen* then is reduced to this:—that instead of Parliament, we have a body of faithful laymen, duly qualified by Test Act, as *bona fide* members of the Church, who can hinder the action of the Bishops, but who can do nothing without them. The learned author calls this action, in England, purely *civil*. Call it what you will, however, the Church of England has set us the example in this restraint upon "a function of the Office inherited by her Bishops." Why, then, such solemn words about the mote in our eye?

Now I grant that by a change in the Constitution of England, which has flagrantly violated the sacred franchises of the



Church, the action of Parliament is no longer Ecclesiastical, and can be recognized as nothing more, nor less, than purely civil, and grossly unjust at that. So far I cordially respond to Dr. Pusey's expressions; but the question is not what the State has done to outrage the Church, but what the Church agreed to, from the first. If Hooker is a proper authority on this point, Parliament, or at least the Laity of the Church there represented, acts on Church questions ecclesiastically, and not merely in process of civil legislation. Hooker's argument amounts to this, that the Laity have the right to consult, and advise, and vote, in Church matters, and that the Church of England has always given them the exercise of this right, in Parliament. He shows that this was done in times before, as well as since the Reformation, and he quotes the great Pope Nicholas as himself allowing lay-counsel in *matters touching the faith*, and in such matters exclusively—(strange to say)—as those "whereunto all men must stand bound." Whether Hooker understands more than this Pope intended to convey, it is nothing to the purpose to enquire. He taught our Fathers that the Church of England admitted, and had always admitted, the Laity to a share in making the Laws which were to bind them. The American Laity inherited this liberty, and it never entered the heads of our Bishops in 1789, that they were surrendering one of their functions, or "adopting a principle belonging to bodies who reject the Apostolic Succession." In this country, John Wesley's *bishops* retain the exclusive prerogative for which our author contends.

But there are some particulars with respect to our legislation which have been brought into question, and which deserve to be better understood by our brethren in England. It is true that they must be considered in themselves, and not as proving anything for or against the Lay-element. It is admitted, by all who know anything of the case, that the same measures would have passed our Synod, had there been no Laymen concerned in it. I must not be understood as defending those questionable measures; but, on the other hand, far be it from me to condemn them. They were adopted by prudent and good men, and consented to by such a man as Bishop Seabury, as what was wise and expedient, considering the times. Perhaps, had they legislated on abstract principles only, they would have destroyed the Faith, which they desired to keep entire, and to hand down to subsequent generations. At all events they have succeeded; and should one of them rise from the dead, he might justify their actual measures, by simply inquiring as to results. Has the Church become less Orthodox, as to the real belief and practice of her Clergy and People? Is it less



Apostolic in its claims and pretensions? Are its Laity less conservative? Is the Church less felt and feared by surrounding heresy and schism? Does it win fewer souls to Christ and to the Unity of the Catholic Communion, than aforetime? Every one of these questions must be answered in a way the very reverse of what should have been the case according to Dr. Pusey's reasonings and insinuations. I am afraid to blame our fathers, therefore, who acted "according to the wisdom given unto them," and, as we humbly trust, by the aid and presence of the *Holy Spirit*. They knew the times, and the people of the new nation, as well as those of their own Communion. They agreed to require, as touching the Faith, only certain *necessary things*. Had they been more "stiff in refusing" all condescension to ignorance and prejudice, they might have carried on their work, in honorable impotency, and their disciples would probably have been found, at this day, as a handful of believers amid a nation of infidels, stoutly reciting the Athanasian Creed, on certain days of the year, and as resolutely hiding their candle under a bushel. On all human grounds of probability, the mighty power exerted by our Church on surrounding dissent, and the bold witness to the Nation, for Catholic Truth, which has been maintained, (to say nothing of the Church's individual growth,) could not have been secured except by the course pursued with respect to the Prayer Book, and the Lay-element. For the Church has uttered no uncertain sound in America. Her character and her Orthodoxy are understood, and felt, in every part of this Republic; and she has effected far more for those beyond her pale, than they themselves suspect. When the "Proposed Book" of 1786 appeared, with the Athanasian and the Nicene Creed both omitted, our Fathers were furnished with proof that the generation which had heard and used the Athanasian Creed all their lives, had failed to catch its meaning and its spirit. After fifty years, without the Athanasian Creed in the Prayer Book, we understand and love it, and were it now part of the book, it could not be stricken out! The Laity would be the last to touch it. Under God I cannot doubt that the honesty of the declaration, that in ceasing to use the English book, there was no intention to depart from Anglican doctrine, has been a great safeguard: and had the Church of England dropped the Athanasian Creed, at the same time, I do not think the result would have been what it has been. But, now, it is chiefly the prevailing unwillingness to touch the Prayer Book that hinders its restoration, though perhaps with the omission of those clauses, which even Dr. Waterland, in his invaluable treatise on the *Quicumque*



vult, pronounces separable, albeit he prefers their retention. And were I to venture a prophecy, I should say that before 1889, there may be such a restoration; and that thousands will then use it, with faith and love, who would never have heard of it, had not the temporary concession been made, as to its use, in 1789. A runner sometimes goes back a few steps, in order that he may get a better start, and come more surely to the goal; and perhaps the Divine Wisdom was in the course which our Fathers pursued. Had I lived then, I could never, with my views of the value of that Symbol, have voted for the omission. I could not have predicted the harmlessness of such a measure; or that the Nicene Creed could have answered alone, in connection with the Articles and the residue of the Prayer Book. But the facts, as they are, seem to justify what was done. For myself let me add that both here, and in the Diocese of Connecticut, I have been accustomed to rehearse it freely at all times, as the doctrine of the Church; and I have often been thanked for so doing, and never heard a whisper of the contrary sort.

I must again remind you, that I am saying what may be said and should be said, in all fairness, for the Fathers of 1789. I do not the less regret what we have lost, through their action, and through their occasional over-anxiety, to commend the Church they loved, to the hearts and judgments of the people at large, whom it was their desire and their duty to win. They knew that the mistakes of the masses were hereditary, and honest; and that they had been greatly embittered by the late war with a king, whom the Dissenters supposed Churchmen regarded as their "Head"—not merely in temporalities, but also in spiritual things, for so they had been perversely taught. The wisdom of serpents was necessary to meet and overcome this state of things; and in adapting the Church to circumstances as widely as possible differing from the English parochial system, they seem to have admitted two general principles. The one was, that the Services might be safely shortened; and the other, that where words and phrases had lost their meaning, and ceased to convey the truth to common minds, they might, in certain cases, be so varied, as to take away opportunity for cavil and mistake. Among a people, not one in a thousand of whom could possibly be trained in Church schools, these general principles seemed to commend themselves as almost indispensable to the success of the Church in seeking Christ's sheep in a naughty world.

These facts will explain the *animus* of many of the changes



actually introduced. As to double forms, the greater or stronger of course includes, and expounds, the less or the feebler. The Church cannot be regarded as setting forth two doctrines; nor because she sometimes says the Lord's Prayer without the doxology can she be supposed to repudiate the doxology, which elsewhere she uses. If, therefore, she authorizes a fuller form, that is her doctrine, even though she may allow another to be valid and sufficient.

Thus, in the Church of England, the three Absolutions are certainly one and the same in doctrine, though that in the Visitation of the Sick more fully and strongly asserts what is equally contained in the other two. So, as in our Ordinal, it matters not whether the Bishop says, "Take thou authority to execute the Office of a Priest, etc.," or whether he uses the form borrowed from the English book; the two forms explain each other, and no one can suppose them to convey different powers and functions. In providing the two forms, instead of one only, however, the Church has made it easy for a Bishop to use the fuller form, even among ignorant people. The congregation is sometimes instructed in the sermon, that the Bishop, though he has choice of two forms, prefers that which is most Scriptural; or if he tells them that he intends to use the other, he also informs them that it is, in meaning, the same with the one he omits.

It was in the same spirit that smaller concessions were made, with reference to archaisms, and expressions which had become offensive to modern ears, and which operated to alienate large classes of the people, from a hearty love of the Church's Offices. One can hardly excuse the change in the beautiful third Collect, for Evening Prayer, from which the *Illumina tenebras* has been dropped, for the prosaic reason, that in country places Evening Prayer was habitually celebrated at one o'clock, and consequently in the full blaze of day! Yet, I suppose, they who had been over and over again forced to expound the propriety of this Collect to a stupid people, and to hear their coarse witticisms on its inapplicability, were pardonable for thinking a less poetical expression more likely to be edifying. As to shortening the Services, it was allowed that the Morning Service consisted of three Services improperly united. In parishes of twenty miles square, people often came ten or twelve miles to Church, and Evening Prayer customarily followed Morning Service with only an intermission of half an hour, in order to give the worshipers time to return to their distant homes. It was not deemed improper, therefore, to allow some discretion to the minister in such cases,



(which were numerous,) seeing he might himself be entitled to some consideration, in view of twenty miles of riding, on a Sunday, to and from his post of duty. Occasional brackets, or a permission to use a shorter, rather than a longer form, or to omit what had just before been repeated, might, therefore, appear very harmless to the most zealous American missionary, and yet seem to smell strongly of heresy, when examined in the closet of a Canon of Christ Church.

We are accused of "bracketing the Nicene Creed," and although this is not the case, unless by "bracketing" be meant something far different from what would naturally be understood by the use of such a term, it is important to note what was actually done with respect to this all-important Symbol. The Synod (apparently in order to supply the want of the Athanasian Creed) introduced this Creed into the Daily Morning Prayer, to be used there, at the discretion of the Minister, in the place of the Apostles' Creed. But when either Creed had been used just before in the Morning Service, he was allowed to go to the pulpit, at the close of the Gospel, not saying the Creed anew; or, when the Eucharist was celebrated apart from Morning Prayer, though the Creed must follow the Gospel, it might be the Apostles' Creed, for shortness, instead of the Nicene. However, to give another opportunity for this Great Confession, it is inserted in the Evening Prayer also; so that, in point of fact, it may be used in the same congregation, three times in the same day, at three several Services, as is not unfrequently the case, on high Festivals. While not sufficiently guarding it from possible disuse, therefore, the *animus* of the Synod of 1789 was rather shown in the multiplying of opportunities for its use, and in the placing of this Creed, in full print, once and again, in the Daily Service, where the eye is, of necessity, made to recognize it constantly, even where it is less frequently made to reach the ear. This is no slight matter, practically. Every child who follows his Prayer Book becomes familiar with the Nicene Creed, in the way which Horace justly describes as the most impressive. His eye transmits the language to his heart, and Truth makes its silent, but deeply graven mark, upon the soul.

It is a pity, that instead of this very grave charge of "bracketing the Nicene Creed," which insinuates so much, though it amounts to so little, the accusation was not made definite by a statement of these important facts. If the Nicene Creed is *bracketed* in our Book, then the *Te Deum* is bracketed in the English Book, for every Minister so disposed may read the *Benedicite* instead of it, all the year round. Supposing, in order



to diminish the possibility of such neglect, it had been set, in the same way, in the Evening Prayer, and in connection with the Eucharist, would it be fair to give a stranger the impression that the English Church was averse to its use? Would it be just, suppressing all allusion to such an exhibition of the real *animus* of the Church, to make mention of "bracketing," in all the vague suggestiveness of the term, to support a charge of unfaithfulness? Would it not be injurious to hint, in a guarded way, that the object of all this was to avoid taking upon the lips words of praise to the Everlasting Son of the Father, or to the Blessed Trinity? It is impossible to read the learned Doctor's insinuations, in this particular, without feeling that he has recorded a charge of all but heresy against such men as Seabury and White. Nay, if they could have acted on the principles he seems to impute to them, they were not merely heretics, but "men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth."

The matter as to the Apostles' Creed is different, and in all charity I suppose the learned author to have been confused by the two cases, and to have spoken of the Nicene Creed as *bracketed*, because the Apostles' Creed is so, apparently. I say *apparently*, for, in point of fact, it is not so, as will be seen. This case illustrates the remark that the Synod of 1789 had no idea of "suppressing the truth," in divers of the changes which have given rise to the charge. With reference to the public Daily Prayer, an eye was constantly had to those "occupying the room of the unlearned." An effort was made to guard against evil from the coming in of unbelievers who might say the Church was *mad*—as the Apostle suggests; and there is evidence that the entire motive for concession, in the minds of some, in those "evil times," was St. Paul's own appeal—"We, then, that are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and *not to please ourselves*; let every one of us please his neighbor, for his good, to edification." In this spirit, with respect to the Apostles' Creed, we find the Synod "pleasing themselves" in all other occasions of its use, but studying to edify the stranger, by an accommodation to his prejudices, in the Daily Prayer. Thus, at Baptism, the question is—"Dost thou believe *all* the Articles of the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed?" In the *Catechism*, the child of the Church is commanded to rehearse the Articles of his belief, just as in the English book; and in the *Visitation of the Sick* the form is again the same as in the Church of England. And yet, in the public recitation of the Creed there is a provision for the omission of "*the descent into Hell*,"



or the substitution of the words, declared to be equivalent—"He went into the place of departed spirits." Now this is "bracketing," or would be so, but for the cautious wording of the rubric, which does not permit *any Clergyman*, but *any Churches*, to use this liberty. The Churches, (of a Missionary Diocese, for example,) united under one Diocesan, may, therefore, by resolving to do so, in their local Synods, adopt this permission, as their local law. But this has never been done in any instance; and consequently, although individuals have sometimes, in rare instances, taken the liberty without authority, the Rubric is in reality, and always has been, a dead letter. And yet it has answered a very important purpose, in keeping before the eye of strangers the fact of the Church's belief in "a place of departed spirits." To many, *the descent into Hell* would otherwise be a phrase of no meaning at all, save as supposed to be something directly conflicting with the text—"To-day, thou shalt be with me *in Paradise*." It need scarcely be added, that the adoption of the *Third Article* and the *Eighth*, in 1801, more fully asserted the entire soundness of the Church on this point. There can be little doubt that our *Eighth Article* would also have contained the acknowledgment of the Athanasian Symbol, were it not that the Synod of 1789, having treated it as a mere hymn, it might have seemed like self-stultifying, had they afterwards pronounced it a Creed which "ought thoroughly to be received." Charity cannot forego this explanation.

To sum up, then, what has been said, as touching our Orthodoxy, we are, in all respects, as to doctrine, identical with the Church of England, for such is our formal declaration. We, therefore, *constructively*, confess the Athanasian Creed, which she declares essential as to doctrine, and we *formally*, in the Articles, acknowledge the substance of the same.

We profess the Apostles' Creed at Baptism, in catechising, in public worship, and at the hour of death, as also in the Articles.

So, too, in the Articles, we profess the Nicene Creed, and we habitually use the same in the Morning and Evening Prayer, and in the Holy Eucharist.

Moreover, we use a Liturgy, or Office for the Holy Communion, in which are embodied with a ritual fulness superior to that of the English book, the true Faith as touching that Holy Sacrament, the Incarnation of the Word of God, and "the benefits which we receive thereby."

Surely "we come behind in no gift" as a Church of the Apostolic fellowship; and great as our deficiencies may be, it



is not in an improper spirit that we must inquire—why, then, are we cast out? Why should the learned Regius Professor endeavor to fix a stigma upon us, not receiving us himself and “forbidding them that would?” What ground is there for imagining that if we are admitted to “closer relations,” we shall communicate a lower tone of orthodoxy to our English brethren? Why not argue more justly and charitably, that our influence is at this moment felt, in the practical defense of the Scottish Communion Office? Why not contrast us favorably with the Irish Church, which is far behind us in all Church-spirit and teaching, and which might take valuable lessons of us, as to work among a hostile people? Why not suggest that although America is to be the chief gainer, of course, the two Churches must be fellow-helpers, and that it is madness to make a schism in the body, or for the head to say to the hand, *I have no need of thee?*

Finally, this whole question of the Lay-element is now fairly opened, and invites the closest study, before it can be settled. A profound acknowledgment is due to Dr. Pusey for the competent learning and patient research which he has devoted to the task of investigating Antiquity, and for the earnestness and candor with which he has given us his conclusions. Of the honesty and purity of his convictions there can be no doubt, and yet his book impresses me with the opinion that it is worked up to support a foregone conclusion, and that its author has been unwilling to see the real bearings of many of his own instances. His discussion of the Apostolic precedent, in the Council of Jerusalem, is singularly inconclusive, for if Apostles might have dispensed with Laymen, so might they have dispensed with Presbyters, and with a Council also. But they gave us a “pattern in the mount,” for the guidance of the Church, after their departure; and that pattern certainly makes it most presumptuous for any one to pronounce our course an innovation. If inspired Apostles teach us, in their great humility, to consult with all, before decreeing for all, and to set forth decrees, only in the name of *the whole Church*, why should not their inferiors be faithful to their example, and fulfill their function in the same way?

On this whole subject I prefer the noble argument of Hirscher, (a name, in every way, equal to that of any living divine,) whose views and conclusions, though he is a *Latin* Catholic, entirely sustain our conduct in America. You may also remember that among the Gallicans we have names of great note, entirely in our favor; and I would ask you, if possible, to procure from Kornicker, at Antwerp, a very interesting *bro-*



chure, by a Belgian Layman, M. Stappaerts, entitled—"Réflexions à propos de la Nomination d'un Evêque de Liège." His conclusions from Antiquity, Romanist as he is, are very different from our author's, for he sees no collision, as we see none, between the Episcopal function and the popular vote. Granted the decision lies with the Bishops; *so it is with us*, and so it must be always; yet if Bishops be restrained from forcing a person upon *an unwilling people*, it is very clear that the people vote, and that the Bishops can do nothing final without them. They vote, whether they actually show hands or not; and the learned author's own precedents may be turned upon him effectually. Give the Anglican Laity the very same powers which, he allows, the Laity had in Cyprian's time, and call it what you choose. Let the Laity act as they did of old, and let the Bishops act as they did with them, and there can be no further debate about the Lay-element. The Bishops may enjoy their decisive authority, and the Laity their restraining power, but the practical result will have been gained.

I am far from maintaining that we in America are so happy as to have hit upon the best and wisest way of enfranchising the Laity; but the more it is examined, the less objectionable it will be found. It is well adapted to our state of Society, as some modification of the Parliamentary theory might be, for England. I attach great importance too, to the very becoming manner in which the lay-votes are given, in our Councils. Each diocese represented records its clerical and lay-vote, so that the diocese is the voter, and not the individual; the estate and not the person. I see no force in the strange reduction to the absurd, which our author attempts, by trying to show that they who can vote and counsel in matters of Faith must also be admitted to pulpits. Surely the people have a ministry, even in the congregation, but it does not follow that the pulpit is their place, for even the Deacon cannot stand there except by special licence. Their response is often as necessary as the *Sursum Corda* of the priest, and very often, without their assistance, the priest would have no right to execute his function at the altar, unless we believe in private masses. In Synods they do nothing more, nor less. They respond to what they have learned and withhold their response if they have not been so instructed. "So we preach,"—say the Bishops; "So we have received,"—say the people; and the truth is witnessed by "the whole Church." If the people are unfaithful, still nothing hinders the Bishops from bearing their testimony in Synods, and teaching the people better in the congregation. The people then are witnesses, with their pastors, and for their pastors, proving their fidelity. They may



be martyrs, or confessors, and yet that would not argue their right to preach in the Churches. The daughters of Philip prophesied, and yet St. Paul would not have permitted them to utter a word, in time of divine Service. It does not always follow, then, that "far higher spiritual gifts" than those of the ordinary pastor, would entitle a person to "preach the Gospel to the poor."

In all that our author says of the function of Bishops, their primary authority, and special gift, as witnesses, no Catholic will hesitate, for a moment, to recognize what he has always believed, and professed. But all this proves nothing, unless it can be shown that they have no right to call upon others to bear such witness as they, too, are capable of bearing, according to their vocation and ministry; unless, in short, it can be shown that to add to their decree the expression, "with the whole Church," diminishes its authority and importance. Practically, you know, the Faith is now settled; Synods are busied with matters administrative, almost exclusively; and it is not likely that once in a century our American Synods will have anything to do on matters essential to Catholic doctrine. When such a case arrives, the Church will not be worth preserving, if its Laity are too ignorant, or too wicked, to act with their spiritual pastors, in "glad concurrence." I will only add, that if "to depart from the rule which the inspired Apostles left with the Church, must needs be the commencement of a perilous course," then the success, which has, thus far, attended the course adopted in the American Church, is so far a proof that we have *not* mistaken the Apostolic precedent, nor the mind of our Master CHRIST. It is strange, indeed, if we were guilty of so gross an *innovation* as is charged upon us, that the third generation of American Churchmen, now far on its way in the century, has not yet discovered any tendency in our Synods to diminish aught from the Faith, or to go back in anything to the beggarly elements from which we are supposed to have set forth. On the contrary, great Catholic principles are growing with our growth, and strengthening with our strength. Without anything to justify boasting, we have yet great reason to be thankful for manifest tokens that God is with us, and that he has made us a "vessel of election," to this great nation. Among the Clergy and Laity who have contributed to the great blessings which we now begin to enjoy, have been many, very many, who have lived the lives, and wrought the works of primitive Confessors. Even the evil days of our Colonial estate, which were represented, of course, in our first Synod, have had little justice done to them. When I look



back to the weary and perilous voyages undertaken by our forefathers, at great personal sacrifices, to secure Apostolic Ordination, and when I think of the poverty, and spiteful usage, in the face of which they patiently persevered, among a disobedient and gainsaying populace; and when I see in the great results of those humble toils, that blessing of God which they labored for, but of which they neither enjoyed the sight, nor the conception, I feel that while justice has never been done to their memory, they have, in fact, been made to suffer the greatest wrong. But they have left children to contend with their enemies in the gate, as well as to enter into the blessings which they have secured for this Western world. With all their failings, they were a noble army of Confessors. They were the greatest benefactors of thousands now upon the stage of life, and of millions yet unborn. Among them, also, were not a few who for attainments and for ripe theological learning would have been ornaments to any age, or country. It is enough to say of them, in a word, that "they behaved themselves uprightly in the conversion of the people . . . . and in the time of the ungodly, they established the worship of God."

Yours, &c.

BALTIMORE, December, 1858.



AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

EARLY JOURNALS OF GENERAL CONVENTIONS.\*

---

JOURNALS

OF THE

GENERAL CONVENTIONS

OF THE

Protestant Episcopal Church,

IN THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;

FROM THE YEAR 1784, TO THE YEAR 1814, INCLUSIVE.

ALSO,

FIRST APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

THE CONSTITUTION AND CANONS,

AND

SECOND APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

THREE PASTORAL LETTERS.

---

PHILADELPHIA :

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY JOHN BIOREN,

NO. 88, CHESNUT STREET.

1817.

---

\* Having already given in previous Numbers of the Review, such portions of the first PRAYER BOOK, known as "THE PROPOSED BOOK" of 1785, as were most important, we now commence the republication of the EARLY JOURNALS of the General Conventions, beginning with the Convention of 1785. These Journals will be given whole and entire, down to the Convention of 1801, and perhaps to a later date. We need not say that these Journals, so important to the Early History of our Church, are at present wholly inaccessible to nearly all our Clergy and Laity.



## PREFACE.

IN the ensuing volume, there are contained all the Journals of the General Conventions of "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," from the beginning of its organization to the present time : including a space of thirty years.

The increasing difficulty of possessing sets of these documents, induced the House of Bishops, at the General Convention held in the month of April, 1814, with the approbation of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, to authorize the present publication by the Subscriber, as may be seen on their Journal, page 294 of this volume. Reference to former transactions being occasionally necessary, not only to account for existing regulations, but for the explaining of them ; it must be perceived, that there was great occasion for the measure adopted. It may be considered as expedient, were no other object in view, than the preparing of materials which may in future interest the curiosity of the Members of this Church.

As the first of the Journals refers to certain proposals, issued by sundry Clergymen and Laymen, assembled in the City of New York, in the month of October of the preceding year ; and as the Journal states those Proposals to have been acted on, without a repetition of their contents ; the Subscriber finds himself called on to give the following narrative.

In pursuance of preceding correspondence, there assembled some of the Clergy of New York, of New Jersey, and of Pennsylvania, in the city of New Brunswick, New Jersey, in May, 1784 : And there being a few respectable Lay Members of the Church attending on public business in the same city, their presence was desired. The immediate object of the meeting, was the revival of a charitable corporation, which had existed before the Revolution ; clothed with corporate powers, under the government of each of the said three Provinces. The opportunity was improved by the Clergy from Pennsylvania, of communicating certain measures recently adopted in that State, tending to the organizing of the Church throughout the union. The result was, the inviting of a more general meeting in the ensuing October, at the city of New York : that being the time and place, wherein, according to the charter of the above mentioned corporation, their next meeting should be held. It was accordingly held, for the revival of the corporation : And there appeared Deputies, not only from the said three States, but also from others ; with the view of consulting on the existing exigency of the Church. The greater number of these Deputies, were not vested with powers for the binding of their constituents : And therefore, although they called themselves a Convention, in the lax sense in which the word had been before used, yet they were not an organized body. They did not consider themselves as such : And their only act, was the issuing of a recommendation to the Churches in the several states, to unite under a few articles



to be considered as fundamental. These are the articles referred to, but not printed in the first Journal; and therefore are now inserted, in a Note to this Preface.\*

WM. WHITE,  
Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

\* The Articles referred to are as follow :

1. That there shall be a general convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

2. That the Episcopal Church in each state, send deputies to the convention, consisting of clergy and laity.

3. That associated congregations, in two or more states, may send deputies jointly.

4. That the said church shall maintain the doctrines of the Gospel, as now held by the Church of England; and shall adhere to the liturgy of the said church, as far as shall be consistent with the American revolution, and the constitutions of the respective states.

5. That in every state, where there shall be a Bishop duly consecrated and settled, he shall be considered as a member of the convention ex officio.

6. That the clergy and laity, assembled in convention, shall deliberate in one body, but shall vote separately: And the concurrence of both shall be necessary to give validity to every measure.

7. That the first meeting of the convention shall be at Philadelphia, the Tuesday before the feast of St. Michael next; to which it is hoped and earnestly desired, that the Episcopal Churches in the respective states will send their clerical and lay deputies; duly instructed and authorized to proceed on the necessary business, herein proposed for their deliberation.



JOURNAL OF A CONVENTION  
OF THE  
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN THE STATES OF

NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, PENNSYLVANIA, DELAWARE, MARYLAND,  
VIRGINIA, AND SOUTH CAROLINA.

HELD IN

CHRIST CHURCH, IN THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,

FROM

*September 27th to October 7th, 1785.*

---

LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CONVENTION.

*From the State of New York.*

The Rev. Samuel Provost, A. M. Rector of Trinity Church, New York.  
The Hon. James Duane, Esquire.

*From the State of New Jersey.*

The Rev. Abraham Beach, A. M. Rector of Christ Church, New Brunswick.  
The Rev. Uzall Ogden, Rector of Christ Church, Sussex.  
Patrick Dennis, Esquire.

*From the State of Pennsylvania.*

The Rev. William White, D. D. Rector of Christ Church and St. Peter's, Philadelphia.  
The Rev. Samuel Magaw, D. D. Rector of St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia.  
The Rev. Robert Blackwell, A. M. Assistant Minister of Christ Church and St. Peter's, Philadelphia.  
The Rev. Joseph Hutchins, A. M. Rector of St. James's Church, Lancaster.  
The Rev. John Campbell, A. M. Rector of York and Huntingdon.  
Richard Peters, Esquire; Jasper Yates, Esquire; Stephen Chambers, Esquire; Samuel Powell, Esquire; Thomas Hartley, Esquire; Edward Shippen, Esquire; John Clark, Esquire; William Atlee, Esquire; Mr. Andrew Doz; Mr. Edward Duffield; Mr. Joseph Swift; Mr. Nicholas Jones; Mr. John Wood.



*From the State of Delaware.*

The Rev. Charles H. Wharton, Rector of Emanuel Church, New Castle.  
The Hon. Thomas Duff, Esquire; James Sykes, Esquire; Mr. John  
Reece; Mr. Joseph Tatlow; Mr. Alexander Reynolds; Mr. Robert  
Clay.

*From the State of Maryland.*

The Rev. William Smith, D. D. Principal of Washington College, and  
Rector of Chester Parish.  
The Rev. Samuel Keene, D. D. Rector of Dorchester Parish.  
The Rev. William West, D. D. Rector of St. Paul's, Baltimore Town.  
The Rev. John Andrews, D. D. (late Rector of St. Thomas's, Baltimore,  
and now) Principal of the Academy of the Protestant Episcopal  
Church, Philadelphia.  
The Rev. James Jones Wilmer, Rector of St. George's, Hartford County.  
Dr. Thomas Cradock.  
Mr. Joseph Couden.

*From the State of Virginia.*

The Rev. David Griffith, Rector of Fairfax Parish.  
John Page, Esquire.

*From the State of South Carolina.*

The Rev. Henry Purcell, D. D. Rector of St. Michael's, Charleston.  
The Hon. Jacob Read, Esquire.  
The Hon. Charles Pinckney, Esquire.



## JOURNAL, &amp;c.

TUESDAY, 27th of September, 1785.

CLERICAL and Lay-Deputies from several of the states assembled ; and judging it proper to wait the arrival of the deputies from the other states,

Adjourned until to-morrow at ten o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, 28th of September, 1785.

The Convention met, according to adjournment; and the Rev. Dr. Keene, by desire, read prayers.

The Rev. David Griffith was unanimously chosen Secretary.

On motion, *Resolved*, That a President be now chosen by ballot, and that each state have one vote; which being done, and the ballots counted, it appeared that the Rev. William White, D. D., was unanimously chosen.

*Ordered*, That the Deputies from the several states produce the testimonials of their appointment; which being done, and the testimonials read,

*Resolved*, That the testimonials produced from the church in the several states, viz. in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, are satisfactory.

The Resolutions of a Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held in the city of New York, on the 6th and 7th days of October, 1784, were read.

*Ordered*, That the same lie on the table.

Adjourned to six o'clock this evening.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, six o'clock.

The Convention met, according to adjournment.

*Ordered*, That the proceedings of a former Convention at New York be again read; which being done, and the different articles considered,

*Resolved*, That the first, second, and third articles proposed as fundamental by the said Convention, are approved of.

The fourth article being read, it was, on motion, *Resolved*, That a Committee be appointed, consisting of one Clerical and one Lay-Deputy from the Church in each state, to consider of and report such alterations in the Liturgy, as shall render it consistent with the American revolution and the constitutions of the respective states: And such further



alterations in the Liturgy, as it may be advisable for this Convention to recommend to the consideration of the Church here represented.

*Resolved*, That the fifth, sixth, and seventh of the aforesaid articles proposed as fundamental are approved of; the sixth article being first explained and understood, as meaning that the Deputies are to vote according to the states from which they come, and not individually.

*Resolved*, That a Committee, to be composed as aforesaid, prepare and report a draft of an ecclesiastical constitution for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

A Committee was appointed accordingly; viz. the Rev. Mr. Provost and the Hon. Mr. Duane for New York; the Rev. Mr. Beach and Mr. Dennis for New Jersey; the Rev. Dr. White and Mr. Peters for Pennsylvania; the Rev. Dr. Wharton and Mr. Sykes for Delaware; the Rev. Dr. Smith and Dr. Cradock for Maryland; the Rev. Mr. Griffith and Mr. Page for Virginia; and the Rev. Dr. Purcell and the Hon. Mr. Read for South Carolina.

*Resolved*, That the preparing the necessary and proposed alterations in the Liturgy be referred to the same Committee.

The Convention adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

THURSDAY, 29th of September, 1785.

The Convention met, according to adjournment; and the Rev. Dr. Magaw read prayers.

*Resolved*, That a person be appointed to assist the Secretary, and to officiate in his stead when he shall be employed in the business of the Committee; and Mr. Clarke was appointed accordingly.

The Rev. Dr. Smith, as Chairman of the Committee for revising and altering the Liturgy, &c. reported, that the Committee had made some progress in the business referred to them, but not having completed the same, desired leave to sit again; which being agreed to,

The Convention adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY, 30th of September, 1785.

The Convention met, according to adjournment; and the Rev. Mr. Provost read prayers.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Committee for revising and altering the Liturgy, &c. do also prepare and report a plan for obtaining the consecration of Bishops, together with an address to the Most Reverend the Archbishops and the right Reverend the Bishops of the Church of England, for that purpose.

The Rev. Dr. Smith, from the committee for revising, &c. reported, that they had made further progress in the business referred to them, but not having finished the same, desired leave to sit again, which was agreed to.

The Convention adjourned to nine o'clock to-morrow morning.



## SATURDAY, 1st of October, 1785.

The Convention met, according to adjournment; and the Rev. Dr. Smith read prayers.

The Rev. Dr. Smith, from the committee for revising, &c. reported, that they had prepared a draft of the alterations to be made in the Liturgy; and that they had also prepared a draft of a general Ecclesiastical Constitution, which he was ready to report.

*Ordered*, That the same be now received; which being done, and the report read,

*Ordered*, That the said report lie on the table for the perusal of the members.

The Rev. Dr. Smith, from the same committee, reported, that they have had under consideration the further alterations to be proposed in the Liturgy, and were ready to report in part.

*Ordered*, That the report be now received and read; which being done,

*Ordered*, That the report last read lie on the table.

*Ordered*, That so much of the revised Liturgy as respects the American revolution and the constitutions of the states be again read, and considered by paragraphs; which being done,

*Ordered*, That the alterations in the Liturgy to be proposed to the church be again read, and considered by paragraphs; which being done in part,

The Convention adjourned to six o'clock this evening.

## SATURDAY EVENING, six o'clock.

The Convention met, according to adjournment.

*Ordered*, That the report from the committee be resumed, and the remainder of it read and considered by paragraphs; which being done,

The Convention adjourned to ten o'clock on Monday morning.

## MONDAY, 3d of October, 1785.

The Convention met, according to adjournment; and the Rev. Dr. West read prayers.

The Rev. Dr. Smith, from the committee for revising, &c. reported, that they had made further progress in the business referred to them, and were ready to report.

*Ordered*, That the report be now received, and that the same be read and considered by paragraphs; which having been done in part,

The Convention adjourned to six o'clock this evening.

## MONDAY EVENING, six o'clock.

The Convention met, according to adjournment.

*Ordered*, That the report of the committee for revising, &c. be re-



sumed, which was accordingly done; and the Convention having made further progress therein,

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

TUESDAY, 4th of October, 1785.

The Convention met, according to adjournment; and the Rev. Mr. Ogden read prayers.

*Ordered*, That clerks be employed to transcribe, under direction of the chairman of the committee for revising, &c. all the alterations proposed, and other matters agreed on by the Convention.

*Ordered*, That the draft of an Ecclesiastical Constitution be read and considered by paragraphs, which was done; and the Convention having made some progress therein,

Adjourned to six o'clock this evening.

TUESDAY EVENING, six o'clock.

The Convention met, pursuant to adjournment.

*Ordered*, That the consideration of the general Ecclesiastical Constitution be resumed, and that the same be read and considered by paragraphs; which being done, and the blanks filled up, was agreed to, and is as follows, viz.

*A General Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.*

WHEREAS, in the course of Divine Providence, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is become independent of all foreign authority, civil and ecclesiastical :

And whereas, at a meeting of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the said Church in sundry of the said states, viz. in the states of Massachusetts, Rhode-Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, held in the city of New York, on the 6th and 7th days of October, in the year of our Lord 1784, it was recommended to this Church in the said states represented as aforesaid, and proposed to this Church in the states not represented, that they should send Deputies to a Convention to be held in the city of Philadelphia on the Tuesday before the feast of St. Michael in this present year, in order to unite in a Constitution of Ecclesiastical government, agreeably to certain fundamental principles, expressed in the said recommendation and proposal :

And whereas, in consequence of the said recommendation and proposal, Clerical and Lay Deputies have been duly appointed from the said Church in the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina :

The said deputies being now assembled, and taking into consideration the importance of maintaining uniformity in doctrine, discipline, and worship in the said Church, do hereby determine and declare,



I. That there shall be a general Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, which shall be held in the city of Philadelphia on the third Tuesday in June, in the year of our Lord 1786, and for ever after once in three years, on the third Tuesday of June, in such place as shall be determined by the Convention; and special meetings may be held at such other times and in such place as shall be hereafter provided for; and this Church, in a majority of the states aforesaid, shall be represented before they shall proceed to business; except that the representation of this Church from two states shall be sufficient to adjourn; and in all business of the Convention freedom of debate shall be allowed.

II. There shall be a representation of both Clergy and Laity of the Church in each state, which shall consist of one or more Deputies, not exceeding four, of each order; and in all questions, the said Church in each state shall have one vote; and a majority of suffrages shall be conclusive.

III. In the said Church in every state represented in this Convention, there shall be a Convention consisting of the Clergy and Lay Deputies of the congregation.

IV. "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England," shall be continued to be used by this Church, as the same is altered by this Convention, in a certain instrument of writing passed by their authority, entitled "Alterations of the Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in order to render the same conformable to the American revolution and the constitutions of the respective states."

V. In every state where there shall be a Bishop duly consecrated and settled, and who shall have acceded to the articles of this General Ecclesiastical Constitution, he shall be considered as a member of the Convention *ex officio*.

VI. The Bishop or Bishops in every state shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the respective Conventions; and every Bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his Episcopal office to his proper jurisdiction; unless requested to ordain or confirm by any church destitute of a Bishop.

VII. A Protestant Episcopal Church in any of the United States not now represented, may at any time hereafter be admitted, on acceding to the articles of this union.

VIII. Every Clergyman, whether Bishop or Presbyter, or Deacon, shall be amenable to the authority of the Convention in the state to which he belongs, so far as relates to suspension or removal from office; and the Convention in each state shall institute rules for their conduct, and an equitable mode of trial.

IX. And whereas it is represented to this Convention to be the desire of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these states, that there may be further alterations of the Liturgy than such as are made necessary by the American revolution; therefore the "Book of Common Prayer, and



Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England," as altered by an instrument of writing, passed under the authority of this Convention, entitled "Alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, proposed and recommended to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," shall be used in this Church, when the same shall have been ratified by the Conventions which have respectively sent Deputies to this General Convention.

X. No person shall be ordained or permitted to officiate as a Minister in this Church, until he shall have subscribed the following declaration, "I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as settled and determined in the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, set forth by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States."

XI. This general Ecclesiastical Constitution, when ratified by the Church in the different states, shall be considered as fundamental; and shall be unalterable by the Convention of the Church in any state.

The Hon. Mr. Duane, from the Committee for revising, &c. reported, that they had, according to order, prepared a plan for obtaining the consecration of Bishops, and a draft of an address to the most Reverend the Archbishops and the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Church of England, and were ready to report the same.

*Ordered*, That the plan and draft now offered be received; which being done, and the same twice read and considered by paragraphs, w ordered to be transcribed.

The Convention then adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

#### WEDNESDAY, 5th of October, 1785.

The Convention met, according to adjournment; and the Rev. Mr. Provost read prayers.

*Ordered*, That the transcribed copy of the "Alterations in the Liturgy, to render it consistent with the American revolution and the Constitutions of the respective states," be read and considered by paragraphs; which being done,

*Resolved*, That the Liturgy shall be used in this Church as accommodated to the revolution, agreeably to the alterations now approved of and ratified by this Convention.\*

---

\* Neither these nor the other *alterations* afterwards proposed, are printed in the Journal, as they will appear in the Book of Common Prayer, now in the press.

The alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer, were those which had been proposed by the Commissioners under King William, A. D. 1689. *Toulman's History of Dissenters*, I, p. 68.



On motion, *Resolved*, That the fourth of July shall be observed by this Church for ever, as a day of thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the inestimable blessings of religious and civil liberty vouchsafed to the United States of America.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the first Tuesday in November in every year for ever, shall be observed by this Church as a day of general thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the fruits of the earth, and for all the other blessings of his merciful providence.

*Ordered*, That a committee be appointed to prepare a form of prayer and thanksgiving for the fourth of July; and a committee was accordingly appointed, viz. the Rev. Dr. Smith, the Rev. Dr. Magaw, the Rev. Dr. Wharton, and the Rev. Mr. Campbell.

*Ordered*, That the alterations in the Liturgy, to be proposed to this Church, be read and considered by paragraphs; and the Convention made some progress therein.

The Rev. Dr. Smith, from the committee to prepare a form of prayer and thanksgiving for the fourth of July, reported, that they had prepared the same.

*Ordered*, That it now be received and read.

*Ordered*, That the said report be read and considered by paragraphs; which being done,

*Resolved*, That the said form of prayer be used in this Church, on the fourth of July for ever.

Then the Convention adjourned to six o'clock this evening.

#### WEDNESDAY EVENING, six o'clock.

The Convention met according to adjournment.

*Ordered*, That the consideration of the proposed alterations in the Liturgy be resumed.

*Ordered*, That the same be again read and considered by paragraphs; which being done, and the alterations agreed to,

*Resolved*, That the said alterations be proposed and recommended to the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the states from which there are Deputies to this Convention.

*Ordered*, That the alterations made in the articles be again read; which being done,

*Ordered*, That the same be read and considered by paragraphs; which being done, and some time spent thereon,

*Resolved*, That the Articles, as now altered, be recommended to this Church, to be by them adopted in the next General Convention.

*Ordered*, That the plan for obtaining Consecration, and the address to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, be again read; which being done, the same were agreed to, and are as follow:

*First*, That this Convention address the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, requesting them to confer the Episcopal character on such persons as shall be chosen and recommended to them for that purpose, from the Conventions of this Church in the respective states.



*Secondly*, That it be recommended to the said Conventions, that they elect persons for this purpose.

*Thirdly*, That it be further recommended to the different Conventions, at their next respective sessions, to appoint committees with powers to correspond with the English Bishops, for the carrying of these resolutions into effect; and that, until such committees shall be appointed, they be requested to direct any communications which they may be pleased to make on this subject, to the committee, consisting of the Rev. Dr. White, president, the Reverend Dr. Smith, the Reverend Mr. Provost, the Honorable James Duane, esq. and Samuel Powell and Richard Peters, esquires.

*Fourthly*, That it be further recommended to the different Conventions, that they pay especial attention to the making it appear to their Lordships, that the persons who shall be sent to them for consecration are desired in the character of Bishops, as well by the Laity as by the Clergy of this Church, in the said states respectively; and that they will be received by them in that character on their return.

*Fifthly*, And in order to assure their Lordships of the legality of the present proposed application, that the Deputies now assembled be desired to make a respectful address to the civil Rulers of the states in which they respectively reside, to certify that the said application is not contrary to the constitutions and laws of the same.

*Sixthly*, And whereas the Bishops of this Church will not be entitled to any of such temporal honors as are due to the Archbishops and Bishops of the parent Church, in quality of Lords of Parliament; and whereas the reputation and usefulness of our Bishops will considerably depend on their taking no higher titles or stile than will be due to their spiritual employments; that it be recommended to this Church in the states here represented, to provide, that their respective Bishops may be called "The Right Rev. A. B. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in C. D." and as Bishop may have no other title; and may not use any such stile as is usually descriptive of temporal power and precedence.

*To the Most Reverend and Right Reverend the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of the Church of England.*

WE, the Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church in sundry of the United States of America, think it our duty to address your Lordships on a subject deeply interesting; not only to ourselves and those whom we represent, but, as we conceive, to the common cause of christianity.

Our forefathers, when they left the land of their nativity, did not leave the bosom of that Church, over which your Lordships now preside; but, as well from a veneration for Episcopal Government, as from an attachment to the admirable services of our Liturgy, continued in willing connection with their Ecclesiastical Superiors in England, and



were subjected to many local inconveniencies, rather than break the unity of the Church to which they belonged.

When it pleased the Supreme Ruler of the universe, that this part of the British empire should be free, sovereign and independent, it became the most important concern of the members of our communion to provide for its continuance: And while in accomplishing of this they kept in view that wise and liberal part of the system of the Church of England, which excludes as well the claiming as the acknowledging of such spiritual subjection as may be inconsistent with the civil duties of her children; it was nevertheless their earnest desire and resolution to retain the venerable form of Episcopal Government, handed down to them, as they conceived, from the time of the Apostles: and endeared to them by the remembrance of the holy Bishops of the primitive Church, of the blessed Martyrs who reformed the doctrine and worship of the Church of England, and of the many great and pious Prelates who have adorned that Church in every succeeding age. But however general the desire of compleating the orders of our Ministry, so diffused and unconnected were the members of our communion over this extensive country, that much time and negociation were necessary for the forming a representative body of the greater number of the Episcopalians in these States; and owing to the same causes, it was not until this Convention, that sufficient powers could be procured for the addressing your Lordships on this subject.

The petition which we offer to your Venerable Body, is,—that from a tender regard to the religious interests of thousands in this rising empire, professing the same religious principles with the Church of England; you will be pleased to confer the Episcopal character, on such persons as shall be recommended by this Church in the several States here represented: Full satisfaction being given of the sufficiency of the persons recommended, and of its being the intention of the general body of the Episcopalians in the said States respectively, to receive them in the quality of Bishops.

Whether this our request will meet with insurmountable impediments, from the political regulations of the kingdom in which your Lordships fill such distinguished stations, it is not for us to foresee; we have not been ascertained, that any such will exist; and are humbly of opinion, that as citizens of these States, interested in their prosperity, and religiously regarding the allegiance which we owe them, it is to an ecclesiastical source only, we can apply in the present exigency.

It may be of consequence to observe, that in these states there is a separation between the concerns of policy, and those of religion; that accordingly, our civil Rulers cannot officially join in the present application; that however we are far from apprehending the opposition or even displeasure of any of those honorable personages; and finally, that in this business we are justified by the constitutions of the States, which are the foundations and controul of all our laws. On this point, we beg leave to refer to the enclosed extracts from the constitutions of the re-



spective States of which we are citizens, and we flatter ourselves that they must be satisfactory.

Thus, we have stated to your Lordships the nature and the grounds of our application ; which we have thought it most respectful and most suitable to the magnitude of the object, to address to your Lordships for your deliberation, before any person is sent over to carry them into effect. Whatever may be the event, no time will efface the remembrance of the past services of your Lordships and your predecessors. The Archbishops of Canterbury were not prevented, even by the weighty concerns of their high stations, from attending to the interests of this distant branch of the Church under their care. The Bishops of London were our Diocesans : and the uninterrupted although voluntary submission of our congregations, will remain a perpetual proof of their mild and paternal government. All the Bishops of England, with other distinguished characters, as well ecclesiastical as civil, have concurred in forming and carrying on the benevolent views of the Society for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts ; a society to whom, under God, the prosperity of our Church is in an eminent degree to be ascribed. It is our earnest wish to be permitted to make, through your Lordships, this just acknowledgment to that venerable society ; a tribute of gratitude which we the rather take this opportunity of paying, as while they thought it necessary to withdraw their pecuniary assistance from our Ministers, they have endeared their past favors by a benevolent declaration, that it is far from their thoughts to alienate their affection from their brethren now under another government ; with the pious wish, that their former exertions may still continue to bring forth the fruits they aimed at of pure religion and virtue. Our hearts are penetrated with the most lively gratitude by these generous sentiments ; the long succession of former benefits passes in review before us ; we pray that our Church may be a lasting monument of the usefulness of so worthy a body ; and that her sons may never cease to be kindly affectionate to the members of that Church, the Fathers of which have so tenderly watched over her infancy.

For your Lordships in particular, we most sincerely wish and pray, that you may long continue the ornaments of the Church of England, and at last receive the reward of the righteous from the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls.

We are, with all the respect which is due to your exalted and venerable characters and stations,

Your Lordships

Most obedient, and

Most humble Servants,

*In Convention,*

Christ Church, Philadelphia, October 5th, 1785.

*Resolved,* That a Committee be appointed to publish the Book of Common Prayer with the alterations, as well those now ratified in order to render the Liturgy consistent with the American revolution and the constitutions of the respective states, as the alterations and new offices



recommended to this Church; and that the Book be accompanied with a proper Preface or Address, setting forth the reason and expediency of the alterations; and that the Committee have the liberty to make verbal and grammatical corrections; but in such manner, as that nothing in form or substance be altered.

The Committee appointed were the Reverend Dr. White, (President) the Reverend Dr. Smith, and the Reverend Dr. Wharton.

*Ordered*, That the said Committee be authorized to dispose of the copies of the Common Prayer when printed; and that after defraying all expences incurred therein, they remit the nett profits to the Treasurers of the several Corporations and Societies for the relief of the widows and children of deceased Clergymen in the states represented in this Convention; the profits to be equally divided among the said Societies and Corporations.

*Resolved*, That the same Committee be authorised to publish, with the Book of Common Prayer, such of the reading and singing psalms, and such a Kalendar of proper lessons for the different Sundays and Holy-days throughout the year, as they may think proper.

*Resolved*, That the same Committee be authorised to publish the Journal of this Convention.

*Ordered*, That the Journal and all the proceedings of the Convention be lodged in the hands of the President.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Rev. Dr. Wharton, having preached a sermon last Sunday on the Duties of the Ministerial Office, highly satisfactory to this Convention and the whole audience, be requested to publish the same.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Reverend Dr. Smith be requested to prepare and preach a sermon suited to the solemn occasion of the present Convention, on Friday next; and that the Service be then read, as proposed for future use.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention be given to the President, for his able and diligent discharge of the duties of his office.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention be given to the Reverend Dr. Smith, for his exemplary diligence, and the great assistance he has rendered this Convention as Chairman of the Committee, in perfecting the important business in which they have been engaged.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention be given to the Reverend Mr. Griffith, for his ability and diligence in the discharge of his duty as Secretary.

Then the members present of the Convention signed all the acts and instruments, and afterwards adjourned, to meet on Friday, ten o'clock, at the Academy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in order to attend divine service and sermon.

FRIDAY, 7th of October, 1785.

The Convention met, according to adjournment, and attended divine service in Christ-Church; when the Liturgy, as altered, was read by the



Reverend Dr. White, and a suitable sermon was preached by the Reverend Dr. Smith; after which the Convention adjourned, to meet this evening at seven o'clock, at the Academy of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

FRIDAY EVENING, seven o'clock.

The Convention met, according to adjournment.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention be given to the Reverend Dr. Smith, for his sermon preached this day before them; and that he be requested to publish the same.

*Resolved*, That the President be requested to preach at the opening of the next Convention.

The Convention then adjourned.

*Signed, by order of the Convention,*

WILLIAM WHITE, *President.*

*Attest.* DAVID GRIFFITH, *Secretary.*

(*To be continued.*)



## BOOK NOTICES.

A LATIN ANALYST ON MODERN PHILOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES. By JOSIAH W. GIBBS, LL. D., Prof. Sac. Lit., Yale College. New Haven: Peck, White & Peck. 1858. 12mo. pp. 158.

In our Number for July, 1857, we noticed a work by Prof. GIBBS, entitled *Philological Studies with English Illustrations*, to which notice we would refer our readers. In that work Prof. GIBBS exhibits, in an apparently desultory manner, his principles of General Philology. In this he applies those principles to an elementary work for the study of Latin. The value of the system, such as it is, is now perceived. It is *method* in instruction.

The *Latin Analyst* consists mainly of Select Latin Sentences, classified and arranged in about sixty sections, so as to bring out the great syntactical principles of the language, and that in a natural order.

The first section is the Imperfect Proposition, or the *impersonal verb* so called. The impersonal verb is placed here, at the commencement, on account of its being the primordial form of human speech. In our common Grammars its true value is overlooked.

The second section is the Simple or Naked Proposition. Its proper form is that of an existence and an activity; as, *the sun shines, the dog barks*. This form has life and energy. The usual examples taken from identical propositions take away much of its vitality.

The third section is when the Predicate Adjective is evolved from the Verb and expressed separately. The difference between *sol lucet* and *sol est lucidus* is here explained.

The fourth section is when the Predicate is a Substantive. The noun in this case becomes an attributive noun.

The seventh section introduces us to the attributive relation, and that in its most simple form, viz., the Attributive Adjective. The nature of the attributive relation, as distinguished from the predicative, is here explained.

The eighth section explains to us the Attributive Substantive in Apposition. The distinction between the attributive substantive and the attributive adjective is here exhibited.

The ninth section explains to us the Attributive Genitive. This regarding of the noun in the genitive case as an attribute is one of the improvements of the Beckerian Philology.

In the tenth section the Attributive Preposition and Substantive is explained as implying an adjective or participle understood.

The twelfth section introduces us to the objective relation, and that in its most simple form, to wit, the Passive or Suffering Object. The three varieties of the passive object are carefully distinguished.

The thirteenth section introduces us to the Dative Object, which is defined in accordance with the latest grammars, as a *personal object sympathizing with the subject*. For Prof. Gibbs' views *in extenso* on this subject, see *Biblioth. Sacra*, Jan. 1858.

The fourteenth section introduces us to the Genitive Object, which is also defined and explained in accordance with the latest grammarians.

The fifteenth section introduces us to the Factitive Object, a topic hardly known to many teachers. The nature of this objective relation is discussed, and the important and beautiful distinction of the *real* factitive, the *moral* factitive, and the *logical* factitive, fully explained. This completes the complementary objective relation.

The sixteenth section introduces us to the supplementary objective relation, and that in its most simple form, the Object of Place. An attempt is made here to arrange the prepositions in pairs, a problem of no little interest.



The seventeenth section introduces us to the Object of Time. Here comes in the Object of Co-existence or Co-etaneous Action, of which the author speaks with a glow of enthusiasm, which may surprise some, but will catch the sympathy of others.

The eighteenth section introduces us to the Object of Manner. Here the attempt of our author to distinguish between the object of manner, which reduces the idea of the verb or adjective to a specialty and the other supplementary objects which individualize, will not be understood without close attention.

The nineteenth section introduces us to the Object of Cause, and into the very heart of Philosophy. Cause, as a grammatical topic, is distinguished here into the *actual-real* ground, the *actual-moral* ground, the *actual-logical* ground, the *possible* ground, the *adversative* ground, and the *ultimate* ground; and each of them carefully defined.

The sections which follow, although no less important than the preceding, will be merely touched upon.

The sections 22—26 are devoted to Intermediate Propositions, or propositions intermediate between the simple and the compound. They are concerned with the simple participle, the gerund or adverbially used participle, the ablative absolute, the simple infinitive, the supine, and the accusative and infinitive. All these are classified and arranged systematically.

Sections 27—29 introduce us to subordinate propositions, and particularly to Substantive Propositions.

Section 30 is devoted to Adjective Propositions.

Section 31 introduces us to Adverbial Propositions, and particularly to Adverbial Propositions of Place.

Section 32 is devoted to Adverbial Propositions of Time in its different varieties.

Section 33 is devoted to Adverbial Propositions of Manner.

Section 34 is devoted to Adverbial Propositions of the Cause. These are distributed under six heads, as was the Object of Cause. It is labored with great care.

In section 35, we have the Adverbial Propositions of Intensity, the true nature of which has been misapprehended by many grammarians.

In section 36, is a very happy, almost algebraic, Notation for subordinate compound propositions.

In sections 37—43, we have six forms of the Co-ordinative Compound Proposition; each with its distinct character, and peculiar type.

Sections 44—51 are devoted to Negative Propositions. These are here, with great advantage, brought together into one view. The author develops here two very important ideas. The first is, *That the negative affects not the predicate, but the predication or copula*. The other is, *That the Latin non, as being more emphatic, belongs to declarative sentences, and ne, as less emphatic, to imperative, optative and subjunctive forms*. This happily explains the difference of *non* and *ne*.

Sections 52—57 are devoted to Interrogative Propositions. These also are here, with great advantage, brought together into one view. The Question and Answer is also dwelt upon.

Section 58th is devoted to Imperative or Volitive Propositions. They consist of five forms, which constitute a sort of sliding scale from the strict Imperative or Jussive to the merely Permissive, which is, as it were, an evanescent volitive.

Section 59 is devoted to the Impassioned Proposition. It is merely an introduction to this important topic. As this subject includes the doxology, it ought to have been extended farther.

In section 60, a mere commencement is made with the Period, a difficult subject to handle.

In section 61, the nature of the Paragraph is explained in a way to be useful to young pupils.

An analysis of the Lord's Prayer is given, which has been greatly commended by some.



The book closes with Dialogues, Fables, and a neat Vocabulary.

We wish success to our author in his attempt to bring down the philosophy of language to young minds.

**THE HEROES OF THE LAST LUSTRE.** A POEM. "There were Giants in the Earth in those days." New York: D. Dana, Jr. 1858. 12mo. pp. 135.

We receive this new Poem just as we go to press, and propose to give it an examination in our next Number.

**THE NEW PRIEST IN CONCEPTION BAY.** In two volumes. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1858. 12mo. pp. 309, 339.

A better exhibition of the genius and spirit of Romanism we have not seen in a long time. Popery has its *exoteric* and its *esoteric* doctrines; its outward dogmas and its inward life and temper. It is against the former of these that our attacks are too often directed. We may assail these and demolish them again and again. Its popery, its Trentine novelties, its Mariolatry, &c., &c., &c., we may brush away as the merest figments; and still, we have not touched the foundations of the system in the hearts of its votaries. *Naturam expellas furca licet, usque recurrit.* And hence it is, that it is so utterly in vain to reason, or to attempt to reason, with the poor dupes who have become inoculated with the virus. This new work shows an appreciation of the genius, the inner life of the Romish System which is remarkable; and the author has power to delineate what he so clearly perceives. As we hope our readers will examine the work for themselves, we shall not analyze it; but the character of Mrs. Barré, the English Churchwoman; and of Mr. Elnathan Bangs, the genuine specimen of a Yankee, is very well done. Chapter XLVI, where Father Debreë, an English pervert who begins to come to his senses, meets and confronts the wily priest, Father Nicholas; and Chapter L, in which Father Debreë unburdens to Father Terence his soul of the convictions which have at last forced themselves upon him—both these chapters show unmistakably the hand of a master. We believe that there is a great deal more of this inward struggle, this deep inner consciousness of the utter rottenness of the whole system, that it is a sham and a lie, than is generally supposed. Some of those who went out from us, have returned to the true Fold, with words full of meaning of what they have seen, and heard, and felt; and our prayers should never cease for the poor victims who are still ensnared. Worthless as they may be to the Church, they yet have souls to be saved.

We see the authorship of this work attributed to the Rev. R. T. S. LOWELL, a Presbyterian of the Church. Whoever be its author, it is full of that quiet power which marks the man of genius, and it cannot fail to make a strong impression on the reader, and to do great good. The heartless, grinding, despotic cruelty of the whole Romish system; its utter unscrupulousness as to means to gain its ends—and this as a matter of rule; its cool, deliberate sacrifice of all the sweet charities of social and private life; the union of the grossest sensualism with an arbitrary asceticism, which the system provides for; the shutting out of CHRIST as the immediate object of the soul's faith, through the intervention of human mediators—all this, and more, is cleverly illustrated in the work before us. There is in it less of doctrinal discussion, than of delineation of the practical workings of Romanism; but where the author does argue, he shows his strength. The distinction between the Romish and the true Absolution, is well stated. The plot of the story is laid on the coast of Newfoundland, whose wild natural scenery is seen and described with a poet's eye. The book is a decided success.

*First Principles of Physics, or Natural Philosophy*, designed for the use of Schools and Colleges, by BENJAMIN SILLIMAN, Jr., M. A., M. D., Professor of General and Applied Chemistry in Yale College. With six hundred and seventy-seven illustrations. Philadelphia: H. C. Peck and Theo. Bliss. 1859. pp. 720.

We are glad to be able to speak of this work as a really valuable contribution



to the manuals of instruction which are already in use. Prepared by one who is not only a teacher, but also a student of Science, aiming to make constant progress, it has a peculiar freshness which cannot fail to interest, and a practical character which will render it extremely serviceable. Our author remarks in his Preface, that "accuracy of statement, fullness of illustration, conciseness of expression, and a record of the latest and most reliable progress of science in these departments, have been the leading objects in its preparation." So far as our examination of the work has extended, we think that he has admirably succeeded in these proposed objects. It is a matter of necessity that each topic must be treated concisely, when in a volume of no larger size so great a variety is introduced. Professor Silliman, in adopting the general division into the Physics of Ponderable Bodies, and the Physics of Imponderable Bodies, treats under the *first*, of the General Properties of Matter, Physical Forces, Crystallography, Statical Forces, Dynamic Forces, Gravitation, Mechanics, Hydrostatics, Hydraulics, Gases, and Acoustics; and under the *second*, of the Properties of Light, Optics, Magnetism, Electricity and Meteorology. Conciseness may be so rigidly enforced as to render a statement obscure; but our author has not fallen into this error, for his statements and explanations while brief are peculiarly clear. Then, too, by the use of smaller type for such parts of the matter as may be regarded of secondary importance, the actual amount of instruction afforded is much enlarged, while the book is kept within reasonable limits as to size.

The work is brought down to the most recent inventions and discoveries pertaining to the topics discussed. Thus, we have a full explanation of not only that interesting optical instrument, the Stereoscope, but also of the Stereomonoscope quite recently described by Mr. Claudet of London, by means of which a *single* picture can be made to present the appearance of relief commonly effected in the Stereoscope by the use of *two* pictures. The explanations of the Electric Telegraph strike us as very clear; and we find the subject of submarine telegraphs more fully explained than we have elsewhere found it, and brought down to the fortunate issue of the attempt to lay the Atlantic Cable, over which we so lately exchanged congratulations amidst the deep mouthed voices of bells and cannon.

That this work will be eminently useful in our higher schools and academies we cannot doubt. As to its adaptation to use in colleges, we have only this query, whether it is on a sufficiently advanced scale, and sufficiently full on certain topics. There is one use for which we can confidently recommend it, viz, as a hand-book for families and for those who need to have the general facts and illustrations of natural philosophy presented in a compact form, yet intelligibly and in an interesting manner. We will only add, that the pictorial illustrations are well selected and executed, and aid greatly in gaining distinct ideas of the various objects and processes represented.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA. A Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge.

Edited by GEORGE RIPLEY and CHARLES A. DANA. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1858. Svo. Vols. I.—III. pp. 764, 784, 786.

As we design to speak somewhat freely of this New Cyclopaedia, we must confess in the outset, that we took the volumes in hand with some misgiving as to what we should find there. For we have not forgotten that the most powerful weapons in unsettling public opinion and revolutionizing France, and introducing all the horrors and atrocities of the French Revolution, were wielded by the French Encyclopedists. Stealthily, at first, the game was played, but it was played effectually. We confess, then, that when we saw one of the Editors of the *New York Tribune* announced as an Editor of this new Cyclopaedia, we could not forget the *Communism*, the *Free-Loveism*, the maudlin Philanthropy, which have been allowed to find an organ for their satanic and dirty principles, in the pages of this same *Tribune*. And when we remember that throughout our whole country, and, especially, in the Western and newer States, the whole framework of our social fabric is shaken to its very foundations, we say that we have a right to know where, on the great social questions of the age, the Editors of a great work



like this are to be found. As far as we can judge, then, it is no part of the design of the *New American Cyclopædia* to be the organ of any school whatsoever, religious, social, or political, either good, bad, or indifferent. On the contrary, it allows each school to tell its own story in its own way; or, to be the exponent of its own principles. And, in a work of this sort, this, perhaps, is all that we have a right to expect. The great difficulty will, of course, come up in the discussion of those points which the infidel may regard as debatable ground; and on which the conflict between truth and error is now waging. One of those terms, for instance, we find in one of the Volumes already before us, viz: *Anthropology*. And, on the whole, we do not know as we have any right to find fault with the treatise upon it. It is less bold and decided in ignoring the material philosophy of the day than we could wish; and there is not a word in it which a socialist, a deist, or a canting humanitarian might not have written. And to speak as a Christian, its statement of the powers and properties of Human Nature is not true. And should we find in the progress of the work, an attempt to infuse a latent infidelity through media of this sort, we shall not hesitate to expose and denounce it. Still in this article, which we have selected as an illustration of the point before us, the distinguishing characteristics of Human Nature are, on the whole, clearly stated, not with Christian, but, as the world goes, with scientific accuracy. In all matters pertaining to the Church, the articles are to be written, as we are happy to be able to state, by Churchmen themselves. But we reserve a more thorough notice of the execution of the work for a future occasion.

The whole work is to be completed in fifteen large octavo volumes, which are printed with double columns, and in a small, yet clear and distinct type. The amount of matter thus condensed and crowded into a single volume is very great. The volumes are sold at \$3 each. We may say here, that the work will be found sufficiently elaborate and complete to meet all the ordinary wants of all classes, the learned and the unlearned; and as a "Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge," we have no hesitation in recommending to our readers to buy it.

ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN PULPIT; or *Commemorative Notices of distinguished American Clergymen of various Denominations, from the early settlement of the country to the close of the year 1855. With Historical Introductions.* By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. Vol. V. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1859. 8vo. pp. 822.

We receive this Volume at too late a day to attempt to do justice to it in our present Number; but shall speak of it at length in our next issue. But we do not hesitate to commend the work to the attention and to the patronage of all our readers. Dr. Sprague's plan led him, of course, to give Commemorative Notices of deceased Clergymen of the Church; and so far from having neglected this portion of his field, we should do him injustice, not to say, that he is entitled to the gratitude of every Churchman for the fullness, thoroughness, and entire impartiality which characterize this portion of his work. In this large volume we have sketches of more than one hundred and fifty of our Clergy; comprising all our deceased Bishops, and those of our Presbyters most distinguished both before and after the War of the Revolution. Besides the delineations of the author, whose labors and industry, and facilities of information, have greatly impressed us, there are also reminiscences by some one, who, from personal familiarity, and doctrinal sympathies, &c., has been able to give the most salient points of character. There are great numbers of such letters in the volume, many of which are specimens of elegant writing, and glow with the warmth of fine noble feeling. The work is adorned with a Frontispiece of BISHOP WHITE, of whom, besides a very complete biography from the pen of Dr. Sprague, there are also beautiful sketches by the Rt. Rev. Bishops H. U. ONDERDONK and A. POTTER, and the Hon. J. R. INGERSOLL. The work is one, of which the author and the Church, both, have a right to be proud; and we trust, that Churchmen will show that they know how to respond to the nobility of spirit which characterizes the author's arduous labors. In comparing this Volume with the four preceding, one peculiarity strikes us



forcibly. It is, that the writers have confined themselves, almost exclusively, to the religious and professional character of the individual. This cannot be, in all cases, because the persons described were not known outside the circle of their professional duties, but because the writers (a great majority of whom are Clergymen, and nearly all Churchmen) seem to have taken for granted, that the Christian Priesthood is enough to engross all one's energies, and to develop all one's strong individuality of character; (that is, if he has any to develop.) But we must reserve a particular examination of the volume until our next Number.

A Collection of Theological Essays from various authors, with an Introduction, by GEORGE R. NOYES, D. D., Professor of Sacred Literature in Harvard University. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 21, Bromfield st. 1856.

We call attention to this volume for the simple purpose, not of reviewing, or commenting upon it, but of showing that a certain School of Theology in the English Church is already doing its work, and that that work is appreciated. We have already protested against the insidious rationalism of the whole movement. Its vulgar appeal to popular sympathy by a perpetual whine about "*progress*," and its blustering pretensions and insolence, are enough to mark its true character in the minds of Churchmen. Professor Noyes in his introduction to the above volume, says, the "Collection" "was suggested by the recent excellent commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul by Mr. Jowett, now Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford."

"The older the world grows, the less must religious faith depend on history and tradition, and the more on the power of the human soul, assisted by the promised Paraclete, to recognize revealed truth by its own light; (p. ix.)

"As sacrifices of blood, in which certain false views of Christian redemption had their origin, passed away from the world's regard gradually, so one error after another has been, from time to time, expunged from the theory of Redemption which prevailed at the time of the Protestant Reformation. Luther laid it down plainly that the sins of all mankind were imputed to Christ, so that he was regarded as guilty of them and punished for them. . . . The now evident fiction involved in charging the sins of the guilty upon the innocent.

"The dissertations selected from the commentary on St. Paul's Epistles by Mr. Jowett are those which were thought to be most suitable for publication in this volume.

It cannot escape the notice of the reader that very few of the essays in this volume were written by professed Unitarians. Most of them are by eminent divines and scholars of the Church of England. But in the circulation of books the great question should be, whether they contain true and just views, and not by whom they were written. That we have been able to select so large a volume of essays on very important subjects, from writers of the Established Church of England, in harmony with the views of Unitarians, is a fact highly encouraging in regard to the progress of truth."

Perhaps our readers may like to know who these men are, thus marshaled into the ranks of supporters of this "damnable heresy," as St. Paul calls it. The list is as follows: M. Guizot; the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., F. G. S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford; Dr. F. A. D. Tholuck, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle; the Rev. Rowland Williams, Fellow, and formerly Tutor, of King's College, Cambridge, and Professor of Hebrew at Lampeter; the Rev. Edward Harwood, D. D.; the Rev. William Newcome, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland; Benjamin Jowett, M. A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford; the Rev. James Foster, D. D.; the Rev. Arthur P. Stanley, M. A., Canon of Canterbury; Dr. Thomas Brown, M. D., F. R. S. Ed., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh.

It will be seen that the nature, authority, and office of the Church, the fixedness of the Faith, and the Doctrine of the Atonement, by the Blood of CHRIST, are among the points on which Unitarianism hails the teachings of these new "apostles of progress." We are not yet done with the subject.



**THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT IN ITS RELATION TO GOD AND THE UNIVERSE.**

By the REV. THOMAS W. JENKYN, D. D., late President of Coward College, London. Third edition, carefully revised by the Author for the American Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859. 12mo. pp. 376.

We cherish a lively recollection of the effect produced on our own mind on the first appearance of this work in this country, now more than twenty years ago. Only one treatise has ever seemed to us more satisfactory; and that was the Charge of Bishop H. U. ONDERDONK, delivered to his Clergy in 1838; to which Charge we refer our readers as a fine specimen of solid, massive reasoning. We know there is a feeling, pretty prevalent in the Church, that the Church has no *theory* as to the nature of the Atonement. This is undoubtedly true. She has no theory on the subject, and ought to have none. And yet, there are few of us who have not heard Sermons from her Clergy, in which theories, and most dangerous theories too, have been earnestly, but unconsciously taught. The great point, at which Dr. Jenkyn has aimed all his strength in this volume, and which we do not hesitate to say, he has thoroughly demolished, is the *commercial* theory of the Atonement. It is the theory, that the Atonement was addressed to God's justice alone; and that it consists in the substitute's suffering the identical penalty due to a limited number of offenders. Out of this theory has grown naturally and necessarily, the doctrine of a limited Atonement on the one hand, and of Universal Salvation on the other. But the theory is all wrong. The author shows that the Atonement is addressed, not to one attribute alone, of the Divine character; but to all His attributes; or, as in the language of Bishop H. U. Onderdonk, that the Atonement is addressed to the Holiness of God. The author was an English Dissenter, who has recently departed this life; and the present edition was revised by him expressly for the American publishers. He is a fine writer, a rigid reasoner, his tone is always reverent; and in the main point of the discussion, the work will carry conviction to the mind of the impartial and thoughtful reader. Our earnest Clergy, especially, will be glad to see so good a work, on so great a theme; one which will impart freshness and depth to their instructions, and, at the same time, guard them against common, yet dangerous errors.

**THE AUTOCRAT OF THE BREAKFAST-TABLE.** Every man his own Boswell. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1858. 12mo. pp. 364.

It used to be said among the Whigs in the times of Gen. Jackson, that when the old General took a pinch of snuff, it was regarded as a signal for a simultaneous, universal sneeze, on the part of the whole Democratic party. It seems to be a good deal so with OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES. Such is his reputation as a wag, that if he was to say the stupidest and flattest thing that could possibly be said, all Yankeeedom would feel called upon to burst forth in general cachinnation. And yet, there is this to be said about Mr. Holmes, and General Jackson too, that however blind, and even silly, public idolatry may become, it does not in the outset choose its heroes without a good deal of discrimination. No man ever acquires such power over the masses without a fair conquest, nor without such a measuring of strength as that he shall be seen to stand, in his department, alone. And this is a wholesome lesson for charlatans and pretenders of all sorts. The man who has really got the "root of the matter" in him, will "carry the day," "in the long run."

This "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," is, as many of our readers know, a series of Papers contributed by Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, to "THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY," the Boston Magazine, and which, on its starting, we greeted with such unequivocal compliments that the Publishers have never sent us the work since. Very likely they will remind us in reply, of the fly on the ox's horn, or say some such thing of us; for success is a great stiffener of buckram, and conservator of dignity, as well as a powerful moral alembic. But upon one thing we shall insist to the very last; that the idea of the "Mutual Admiration Society," which forms



the subject of one of Dr. Holmes' clever papers, was a child of the *Church Review*. That point we shall never give up. We shall not attempt an analysis of these Papers; nor compare their author with CHARLES LAMB, or with CHARLES DICKENS, of whom as Humorists he reminds us; and yet he is not very much like either, and is on the whole, superior to them both. He only needs English endorsement to make him, at once, the best humorous author of the day. We confess that we like Holmes, for his downright honesty; his entire freedom from everything like cockneyism; his unstudied naturalness; his simplicity of manner, which marks at once, the man of taste and culture; as well as for his fine sentiment, good sense, and good humor. Indeed, there is a great deal of true nobleness of nature among many of these Boston gentlemen; which some men, who profess to be more orthodox in Creed, would do well to imitate. They are not all Parkers nor Garrisons. In fact, it used to be one of the strong arguments for Unitarianism, that, if Unitarians were not Christians, they were at least, gentlemen.

THE NEW TESTAMENT; or, the Book of the Holy Gospel of our Lord and our God, Jesus the Messiah. A Literal Translation from the Syriac Peshito Version. By JAMES MURDOCK, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1858. 8vo. pp. ix, and 515.

This important work is not to be classed with the new translations of the original Greek. It is a new translation of the old Syriac Version, in the vernacular tongue of the Apostles themselves, in whose language the New Testament appeared in the very first age of the Church. This Syriac New Testament, therefore, gives what may be called the Apostolic interpretation of the Word of God. The work is slowly but decidedly finding the very best reception. Scholars and unlettered Christians, alike, are using it, to know how the Apostles themselves understood the New Testament. A public teacher and a Scholar writes, Nov. 17th, 1858, "Next to the Greek Original, it affords me more effective assistance as a public teacher, sheds more light on the language of Inspiration, than any production within my reach."

The Appendix to this volume, which is one of the noblest monuments of the learned Author, contains a full statement of Syriac Biblical Literature extant; and it contains also, what must interest Churchmen especially, the Lessons appointed to be read in the old Syriac Churches.

The Messrs. Carters have just issued a new and beautiful edition, with the author's latest corrections.

NEW EDITION OF MURDOCK'S MOSHEIM. Sixth Edition, INSTITUTES OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, ANCIENT AND MODERN, in four Books, much corrected, enlarged and improved, from the primary authorities. By JOHN LAWRENCE VON MOSHEIM, D. D. A new and literal translation from the original Latin, with copious additional Notes, original and selected. By JAMES MURDOCK, D. D. Sixth edition, revised and corrected. In 3 vols. cloth. 1858.

The Messrs. Carters have also issued a new edition of this great work of Dr. Murdock. Its reliability in historic statement, its thorough condensation of material, its methodical arrangement, and its mass of solid learning in every department of historic research in Church history, have made this a standard work in nearly all the theological Seminaries of the country, and indispensable in every well furnished private library. The Notes of the American translator, drawn from the wealth of ancient and modern history, and which are the fruits of his ripest scholarship, enrich this edition. Three or more pirated editions of this American work have already appeared in England. Mosheim is the only modern German historian who has been able to write Church History without sinking into a philosophical dogmatizer. We do the publishers the justice to say that, in mechanical execution, the last is an improvement on former editions, and is yet furnished at a somewhat reduced price.



**HISTORY OF FRIEDRICH THE SECOND, CALLED FREDERICK THE GREAT.** By THOMAS CARLYLE. In four volumes. Vols. I and II. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 12mo. pp. 485, 556. New Haven: E. Downes.

Carlyle's History of Frederick the Great has all the glaring faults and attractive eccentricities, which mark everything that comes from his pen. Slovenly, utterly regardless alike of Grammar and Rhetoric, his work is not so much a clear and connected history, as a series of bold and dashing portraits. One needs to be well posted in the political changes, which have occurred in those petty states and principalities for the last century and a half, to follow the author with any satisfaction. The two volumes already published, so far from treating of Frederick the Great, are devoted to the history of the Prussian Government, beginning with the foundation of the House of Brandenburg, A. D. 928; and to what Carlyle calls Frederick's apprenticeship, or his education, discipline, and training, under the stern, iron rule of his Father, Frederick William. This brings us to the close of the second volume; in both which we are treated to amusing sketches of manners at the German Court. The most prominent features in the life and character of Frederick the Great are not, thus far, touched in the progress of this work. In the great commotion of social elements, the heaving and upturning of old opinions, the rebellion of human reason and human right against Romish superstition and Romish tyranny, which finally found expression in the French Revolution, in all this movement, which was the great event of the Eighteenth Century, Frederick was a principal actor. Himself a thorough Deist, a bitter hater of the Church and the priests, he was in the closest intimacy with such men as Voltaire, D'Alembert, the Marquis d'Argens, De Condorcet, and M. Jordan; and no one can better learn the real character of the King than in his own posthumous works, and in his unreserved correspondence with the above persons, which appeared in thirteen large volumes after his decease. Unfortunately for Mr. Carlyle, he is the last man in the world to do justice to such a theme.

**THE HISTORY OF PROSTITUTION; ITS EXTENT, CAUSES AND EFFECTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.** (Being an Official Report to the Board of Almshouse Governors of the City of New York.) By WILLIAM SANGER, M. D., Resident Physician, Blackwell's Island, New York City, Member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; late one of the Physicians to the Marine Hospital, Quarantine, New York, &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 8mo. pp. 685. New Haven: E. Downes.

Dr. Sanger, the author of this volume, and the leading physician in the Hospital on Blackwell's Island where syphilitic diseases are treated, entered upon the preparation of this work at the suggestion of the Governors of the Almshouse of the City and County of New York. So astounding is the prevalence of the vice of prostitution in New York, and in all our cities, and so signal and awful is the visitation of God's providential judgments, with which He visits this particular sin, that the above gentlemen determined to waive all considerations of delicacy, and to make a thorough expose of the whole subject. If such a work must have been done, Dr. Sanger was the man to do it. We confess, we have some doubt as to the utility of such a publication; and yet its disclosures are so loathsome; its lessons of warning are so fearful and startling, that we may as well look the subject fairly in the face. In one respect, we think Dr. Sanger has erred in judgment. He has attempted a brief summary of all the facts and statistics of this vice in ancient as well as in modern times. But pray! why drain the cesspools of heathenish debauchery, and hunt up the passages in the Greek and Roman poets and historians, which are steeped in lustful depravity? If it was the object of Dr. Sanger's enquiry to gather information, sanitary, legal, and moral, which should facilitate reform at home, why fill so large a portion of this large volume with obscenity, so gross as to be unfit for publication, and having no bearing upon the object of his work? The chapters in which the author records the precautionary measures which some European Governments have taken to arrest the evils of this vice, are



doubtless valuable; and in gathering information, as to the extent of prostitution in New York and in several of our large cities, he has been aided by the police authorities who have sent him their official reports. As to the City of New York, the following are the results of his enquiries.

"There are six thousand public prostitutes in the City of New York. The majority of these are from 15 to 25 years old. Three-eighths of them were born in the United States. Many of those born abroad came here poor to improve their condition. Education is at a very low standard with them. One-fifth of them are married women. One-half of them have given birth to children, and more than one-half of these children are illegitimate. The ratio of mortality among children of prostitutes is four times greater than the ordinary ratio among children in New York. Many of these children are living in the abodes of vice and obscenity. The majority of these women have been prostitutes for less than four years. The average duration of a prostitute's life is only four years. Nearly one-half the prostitutes in New York admit that they are or have been sufferers from syphilis. Seduction, destitution, ill treatment by parents, husbands or relatives, intemperance and bad company, the main causes of prostitution. Women in this City have not sufficient means of employment. Their employment is inadequately remunerated. The associations of many employments are prejudicial to morality. Six-sevenths of the prostitutes drink intoxicating liquors to a greater or less extent. Parental influence induced habits of intoxication. A professed respect for religion is common among them. A capital of nearly \$1,000,000 is invested in the business of prostitution. The annual expenditure on account of prostitution is more than \$7,000,000. Prohibitory measures have signally failed to suppress or check prostitution. A necessity exists for some action. Motives of policy require a change in the mode of procedure."

In respect to the manner of treating this vice, instead of attempting to repress it by legal prohibition, the author recommends that it be simply "regulated;" and its injurious results encountered, and weakened; as is done in some of the countries of Continental Europe. Thus he proposes:

"1. A suitable hospital for the treatment of venereal diseases.

"2. A legally-authorized medical visitation of all known houses of prostitution, with full power to order the immediate removal of any woman found to be infected, to the designated hospital.

"3. The power to detain infected persons under treatment until they are cured—a term of time which none but medical men can decide."

There are other aspects of this whole subject, however, in which it will be viewed by the Christian moralist. While the author has named several of the principal causes of the frightful prevalence of prostitution in our country at the present time, there are two or three, deserving of more special attention.

1st. Whatever tends to discourage Marriage, tends, in the same degree, to promote prostitution. And yet the mistaken views of life, and the ambition of parents in respect to the settlement of their children, render the marriage relation, with thousands on thousands, utterly impracticable.

2d. Whatever tends to destroy the sanctity of the Marriage Relation, tends, in the same degree, to promote the spread of this vice. And yet, some of our most influential newspapers, and several of our most popular writers and Lecturers, have propounded social theories which sap the foundations of all social purity, and would make every house a brothel. And several of these are among the noisiest of our whining "*reformers*!"

3d. A new policy, another treatment, is demanded towards the destroyer of female virtue. Now, the seducer is treated as a gentleman; though known to be a debauchee, he is received into good society; and the mother welcomes with smiles the heartless villain to the presence of her daughters; while the poor victim of his crime is repelled as a leper. This is all wrong; unless, indeed, that mother at heart is no better than she should be. Brand such a wretch with the mark of Cain, whoever he may be. The robber is a saint to him. Let society everywhere feel, let the Clergy, and let parents, everywhere teach, that when domestic purity and virtue is lost, everything is lost.



As to the duty of the State, what it can do, and what it ought to do, with an evil of such appalling magnitude, is a grave question, and is not without its difficulties.

We have been loth to touch this subject at all. But, believing, as we do, that this vice is increasing among us, among the high, not less than the low, we are not to be deterred, by a false delicacy, from speaking plainly of it.

Among the curious facts disclosed in this volume, one is, that in Ireland, abandoned women number *one* to every 4,000 of her population; in Scotland, *one* to every 16,000; and in England, *one* to every 50,000. And yet we are told perpetually, by popish priests, of the "proverbial purity" of the Irish Roman Catholic females!

SEVENTH ANNUAL ADDRESS of the Bishop of the Diocese of Illinois. 1858. 8vo. pp. 40.

The breadth of view, the distinctness of Church tone, the strong conservative, yet aggressive spirit of the Bishop's counsels, and the large record of Episcopal labors and of noble results as witnessed to in this Address of Bishop Whitehouse, are in a high degree cheering and encouraging. What strikes us, also, as specially noticeable in this Address, is the Bishop's remarks upon the late "Religious Awakening," and upon the duty of Churchmen to work for Christ, in those ways and by those instrumentalities which we believe He hath Himself appointed, and which He has never failed to bless. The subject is so important and so practical in its bearings upon the position and duties of our Clergy, that we shall venture a few observations upon it in the present connection. We believe them to be called for. What we mean to say then, is, that the present Revival System, in its essential features, is a modern thing, and was unheard of until later times. It is characterized, specially, by its ignoring, practically, and theoretically, the Covenant of Grace; the Sacraments as Signs and Seals of that Covenant, and means of that Grace, and the whole work of Christian Nurture based upon that Covenant relationship. It is characterized, also, especially by the stress it lays upon a sudden, instantaneous, conscious conversion; and this as the result of special periodic influences of the HOLY GHOST attending special human instrumentalities. In this latter aspect, the whole system has a strongly Calvinistic appearance; and is one of the fruits of a Calvinistic theology. And yet the early Augustinians made no such distinctions between the Sacraments and the Means of Grace. The present Revival System, therefore, is a modern thing, and however much of good it may seem to have accomplished, it is, at least, a doubtful experiment; and if it is to take the place of that system which the Church has received from the beginning, it is a dangerous experiment. We doubt if it is generally regarded, what a change has come over the whole Puritan mind as to this whole subject of practical, vital, religion. Thus, the famous Richard Baxter relates, "that he was once at a meeting of many Christians as eminent for holiness as most in the land, of whom divers were ministers of great fame; and it was desired that every one should give an account of the *time and manner* of his conversion; and *there was but one of them all that could do it*. And (says he) *I aver from my heart, that I neither know the day nor the year when I began to be sincere*." (Baxter's Infant Baptism, pp. 120—33.)

Our remarks, thus far, have had reference wholly to the commencement of the work of personal religion in the heart. We might speak, if our space permitted, of the wrong conceptions of religion which the Revival System fosters; how its sensuous emotionalism, so powerful in its sway over the uncultured masses, and even over some persons of higher grade, has, notwithstanding, no necessary connection with Christian principle; and how, at best, it tends to present only a one-sided religionism, lacking in the higher and truer graces of the Christian character. What the result of the late "Religious Awakening" is, on the whole, to be to the cause of religion, is as yet a question. Some important facts are already before us, concealed from the public, yet unquestionably true, which would seem to prove that there was a great deal of the "merely human" in the movement; so much, at least, as to put Churchmen upon their guard.



*Histoire de la Reforme en Angleterre*, par le R v. F. C. MASSINGBERD, M. A., Cur  d'Ormsby, Dioc se de Lincoln, et Chanoine de Lincoln, Traduit de l'Anglais, Edit  avec une Preface par le R v. Fr d ric Godfray, D. C. L. (Oxford and London: J. H. & J. Parker. Paris: Dentu. 264 pp. 3s.)

*Sermone fatto dinnanzi all' Universit  di Oxford nella festa dell' Annunciazione, 1855, sul dogma Romano della Concezione della Beata Virgine Maria, da Monsignor WILBERFORCE, Vescovo di Oxford.* (Oxford and London: J. H. & J. Parker. Malta: Muir. 40 pp. 6d.)

These two works are translations, under the auspices of the Anglo-Continental Society, of two admirable publications; the first, of Massingberd's History of the English Reformation, into French, by the Rev. Dr. GODFRAY; and the other, of the Bishop of Oxford's Sermon on the New Dogma, into Italian. The first will give the so much needed information to Romanists and others on the Continent, as to the real character of the English Church; and the other will point them to the contrast between the Ancient Church and the modern Ultramontane system. It is encouraging thus to see attention directed, at home as well as abroad, to the true basis on which the Church of God stands. Such truths followed up by personal effort and unceasing prayer, cannot fail of important results.

THE HARVEST AND THE REAPERS: Home Work for all, and How to do it. By HARVEY NEWCOMB, Author, &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 12mo. 1858. pp. 270.

This work is thoroughly Anti-Church in its conception of Christianity, and pushes the idea of *individualism* to its extremest bounds. The author says, "the Church as a corporate body has no soul;" he might have said, that, according to his theory, it has no existence. And yet, feeling the necessity of some comprehensive organization, he advocates the establishment of a Board, to which "all the City Mission, Bible, Tract, Sabbath School, and Poor Associations shall surrender their functions." It proposes to map out the country into districts; and to send its "visitors" into every family of the land, even if such family is already "cared for by its pastor and members." It seems that some such plan is already in operation in New England, and its meddlesome impertinence we have heard alluded to. "Prayer Meetings" and "Revivals," are the two sacraments which this new Board recognizes as its means of Grace. The principal value which this book has to us, is in its statements of the religious destitution of the country, and, especially, in those parts where the Puritan System has had its fullest and fairest trial for the last two centuries. The author says, and apparently proves, that in Maine nearly three-fourths of the population have no connection with the worship of any denomination. In New Hampshire it is estimated that at least two-thirds of the population are not, except very indirectly, under the influence of the ordinances of evangelical religion. In Vermont, it is said that not one-fifth part of the population is usually found in any place of public worship on the Sabbath. In Massachusetts, the neglecters of public worship are estimated at three-fourths of the entire population; while in the mountainous districts of Berkshire county only about one-seventh can be depended on as hearers of the Gospel. In Connecticut an aged clergyman in the central part of the State, estimated the attendants on public worship of every kind as ranging from a fifth to a seventh. The author says, "from a pretty extensive acquaintance, in different States, I believe the proportion [who attend public worship in New England] is much greater than that of the whole country."

Such are the startling and undenied results of Puritanism and Dissent in New England. They are put forth, too, by a man, one object of whose work is, to ignore, or to break down, that System of the Church, whose organic unity and life, and activity, are beginning to be seen and felt in these moral wastes of our country. That the Church is doing what she ought cannot be claimed; but that she has capacities for meeting the spiritual wants of this country, and that she is beginning to put them forth, we verily believe.



A FEW WORDS on the Religious Movement of the day; The Union Prayer Meetings; and the Position of the "High Church Party." By AN OBSERVER. New York: D. Dana, Jr. 1858. 12mo. pp. 23.

The late "religious movement" in this country, with all the other aspects in which it is capable of being viewed, presents one, which as yet has received little attention; we mean the influence it has exerted, and is to exert, on the cause of "CHRISTIAN UNION." The great mass of professing Christians who have been thus brought together under the influence of strongly awakened sympathies, seem to have felt, as if for the first time, that separations, schisms, sects, in the One Body of Christ, are wrong, un-Scriptural, and sinful. The old cry, which we used to hear, that "separations are, on the whole, a good thing," has ceased. So strong is this pressure, that some Churchmen, and two, at least, of our nominally Church papers, have taken ground which, if consistently carried out, will practically annihilate all distinction between us and the Sects. The Ministry, at least, would be no bar to such fusion. The Sectarian leaders, as we notice, already observe this, and are chuckling over it; while Churchmen who teach and act, as we believe, more consistently and wisely in this matter, are greeted with a new storm of unsavory epithets. These "FEW WORDS," before us, are well chosen, and the little *brochure* is a sensible and timely one; it is written, withal, in a good spirit.

The whole subject of Prayer Meetings, and Union Prayer Meetings, and Revivals we shall be glad to discuss at an early day. It opens up a number of grave questions; and involves certain principles of the first importance.

SELF-MADE MEN. By CHAS. B. SEYMOUR. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 12mo. pp. 588.

We have here the "lives" of sixty men, eminently "Self-made men," who have attained eminence in various professions, as Mechanics, Statesmen, Scholars, Artists, Philosophers, &c., in spite of adverse circumstances of birth and fortune. The subjects of these Memoirs are well chosen, and the strong points of individual character are briefly but faithfully sketched. In our own country, the effect of such a volume must be incalculable, and of the right kind; for it presents before the American youth the only true nobility, the nobility of soul; and where, in the absence of the prestige of high birth and of its refining tendencies, we are exposed to the leveling influences of a vulgar pretentious snobocracy. The work ought to go into all our popular libraries.

BESSIE MELVILLE; or Prayer Book Instructions carried out into life. A Sequel to "The Little Episcopalian." By M. A. C. New York: D. Dana, Jr. 1858. 12mo. pp. 354. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

The sentiment of this book is so genuine; the devotion to Christ, and His Church, so deep, and true, and unmixed; its tone of personal character and feeling so noble; that it reads like an English Church story. It is pleasant to meet with an American writer who can look at the Church as a living body, with a head, and heart, and soul, with human sympathies and affections, which meets us at the very entrance upon life, and goes with us into all its struggles, trials, duties, and joys, and which never leaves us till she utters a blessing and prayer over our graves. The high Christian culture evinced by the writer was never learned outside of the Church, and could not have been learned there. It is a good book for Sunday Schools and Parish libraries.

We have from the "Church Book Society" the following contribution of nice little volumes to the stock of our Sunday School Literature.

1. QUESTIONS ON THE SUNDAY EVENING LESSONS in the Church Service, by a Layman of Connecticut. Vol. II. Second Lessons. 1858. 16mo. pp. 203.

These questions have already been well proved, and will be found admirably adapted for Bible Classes and for the older classes in Sunday Schools.



2. *BESSIE MELVILLE*; or, Prayer Book Instructions carried out into life. 16mo. pp. 354.

Of this volume we have spoken as above.

3. *LIFE OF BISHOP WAINWRIGHT*. By Rev. JOHN N. NORTON. 16mo. pp. 184.

Mr. Norton has, we think, been more than usually successful in delineating the life and character of one whose memory is so fresh in the history of Churchmen.

4. *THE CLAREMONT TALES*; or, Illustrations of the Beatitudes. 16mo. pp. 199.

This is one of the A. L. O. E. volumes, which are so deservedly popular. In one of these "Tales," "The Water Cresses," some of the pernicious teachings of the Romish Church as to the nature of personal religion are clearly illustrated. The very heart of that System, its conceptions of the nature of the Christian life, are all wrong.

5. *TRUTH IS ALWAYS BEST*; or, the Fatal Necklace. By MARY and ELIZABETH KIRBY. 16mo. pp. 131.

An English juvenile story, well illustrating the motto, "A fault confessed is half redressed."

6. *MIA AND CHARLIE*; or, a Week's Holiday at Rydale Rectory. With Illustrations, by BIRKET FOSTER. 16mo. pp. 309.

Another English story; a picture drawn to the life, of a spoilt, wrong-headed, willful boy, and of his amiable, gentle, and affectionate sister. It is a good story for some boys, and some parents, too, to read.

7. *TRUE HEROISM*. By A. L. O. E. 16mo. pp. 147.

The motto of the title is illustrated by a number of stories told in the author's most effective style.

8. *LOSING THE WAY*. By JENNY MARSH PARKER. 16mo. pp. 232.

The fatal consequence of filial disobedience and early impiety, and the stains and stings, which, at the best, they always leave behind them cannot fail to be impressed upon the reader of this very well written little volume.

9. *THE VELVET CUSHION*. By J. W. CUNNINGHAM, A. M., Vicar of Harlow. 16mo. pp. 174.

This little volume is an old book reprinted. We can only say, here, that it is a juicy nut, and the English critics found it a hard one to crack. Certain Dissenters thought they saw in it a "masked battery" against themselves; and certain Churchmen thought the missile was aimed in another direction. This old Velvet Cushion has a long story to tell, of what it has heard in its days. We predict for the volume that it will be both popular and useful among us.

10. *THE TORTOISE SHELL COMB*. 16mo. pp. 107.

A simple little story of humble life, but true to nature and to the Church.

11. *THE STORY OF A NEEDLE*. 16mo. pp. 125.

12. *THE TWO PATHS, AND OTHER STORIES*. 16mo. pp. 108.

Both these two volumes are by A. L. O. E.



The volumes which our "Church Book Society" is so industriously providing for the children of the Church, are well calculated to inspire in them the true spirit of our religion, to lead them to a true appreciation of the Blessed Body of Christ, and to make them living members of the same. In doing this great and good work, the Society must win the confidence of all except those whose whole view of the Christian Life and of Christian Nurture has been learned in the Romish, or the Rationalistic School. We are glad to know that all, except a few extreme ultraists of both these two Schools, are working with the Society or withdrawing opposition to it.

THE HISTORICAL MAGAZINE, and Notes and Queries concerning the Antiquities, History and Biography of America. New York: C. B. Richardson, 348 Broadway.

We have before called attention to this Monthly, as filling an important gap in our periodical literature. It is under the editorial direction of the Hon. GEO. FOLSON; and in its successive issues, may be found contributions from such writers as Edward Everett, Geo. Bancroft, Jared Sparks, Peter Force, James Savage, W. H. Prescott, Robert C. Winthrop, Wm. Gilmore Simms, Dr. John W. Francis, Henry R. Schoolcraft, Benson J. Lossing, Henry C. Murphy, Samuel G. Drake, John G. Shea, Esq., Alfred B. Street, E. B. O'Callaghan, Prof. W. W. Turner, Buckingham Smith, Evert A. Duyckinck, William Duane, Brantz Mayer, John R. Bartlett, Samuel F. Haven, Dr. R. W. Gibbs. It is also a sort of unofficial organ of the various State Historical Societies; and gives regularly official reports of their meetings, the most interesting papers read before them, revolutionary letters, biographical sketches, local customs and anecdotes. No one who has not given his attention to such matters, can know the value of these fugitive waifs of history, which form the staple out of which the historian weaves the thread of his narrative. The work is published as above at \$2.00 per annum.

WHY I AM A CHURCHMAN. The Pitts Street Chapel Lecture, in answer to the question "Why I am a Churchman." By the Rev. GEO. M. RANDALL, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Messiah, Boston. Published for the author, by James B. Dow. 1858. 12mo. pp. 108.

In the winter of 1857-8 an association connected with an Unitarian Society in Boston, invited the Clergy of six denominations to preach in the Unitarian Meeting House, a course of Sermons in defense of their own distinctive principles. The Rev. Dr. Randall says he believed it to be not only right, but a bounden duty to accept the invitation, and to plead for the Church. We need not say that Boston is the hotbed of modern *isms*, heresies and schisms; the head-quarters of a bitter and learned infidelity; where, for some reason, the Church is kept in abeyance; and where Popery is having a rapid growth, and is becoming rampant and defiant. It is the very place of all others for the bold, fearless presentation of the claims of the Church; and of the Faith once delivered to the saints. The Sermons delivered in the above course have been published, and *thirteen thousand* copies circulated. The Rev. Dr. Randall has here given in a pamphlet, his own argument. It is clear in statement; frank in manner; honest and open in its tone; moderate yet firm in its claims; and really has nothing in it which any Churchman, worthy of the name, can object to. It is just such a presentation of the claims of the Church as will secure the conviction of honest and enquiring minds. As a Boston production, a great merit in it is its entire freedom from that perpetual whine and cant about "*progress*," so prevalent at "the modern Athens." We do not know of a better argument for general circulation.



SIDNEY GREY. A tale of School Life. By the Author of "Mia and Charlie."  
New York: General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union and Church  
Book Society. 1859. pp. 358.

This book is the largest and one of the best of the recent issues of the Church Book Society. In its typographical execution, it is very superior, and is illustrated with several handsome wood cuts, making it a beautiful Christmas gift.

It is the story of a Christian boy at one of those noble public Schools, for which England is so justly celebrated; and the lesson of patient and gentle forbearance, under numerous trials and vexations, so admirably illustrated in the life of the hero of the tale, Sidney Grey, may well be copied by young and old. The work is dedicated to "boys," to whom, in the introduction, the author says:

"MY DEAR BOYS,—When you and I read stories together you used to often complain that, *in books*, the girls were always the best. You seemed to think this a very unnatural and improbable state of things for authors to persist in depicting; and now I hope you will allow that, in the tale I have written expressly for you, I have at least followed your views in one respect, and done due honor to your state by making a boy the best.

"Do not turn round upon me now, and say that my hero is too good a boy, and that it is of no use at all for you to try and be like him. I don't know how good you think it right for a boy to be, but I know that there was once One who had been a boy Himself, and who knew the thoughts of every heart, and the temptations of every condition; and He said, not to one or two, but to the multitude, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect.

Yours ever,

A. K."

We unhesitatingly commend this volume to the attention of all. No parish or Sunday School Library should be without it.

THE ALBION: A British, Colonial, and Foreign Weekly Gazette. New York.

To those of our readers who do not know what the "*Albion*" is, we take pleasure in saying, that it is a very faithful representative of our good, old, sturdy, plethoric, and choleric, Uncle John over the water; and that it is, on the whole, the most gentlemanly newspaper in the whole list of our exchanges. We find in a late number, the following severe, but not wholly undeserved criticism on Macaulay, which is worth preserving.

"The prince of the penny-a-liners, Macaulay, is ardently admired by all the penny-a-liners. But the best that can be said to him is, that he is a brilliant Whig pamphleteer. He had neither genius nor a noble nature to sell to a party; but whatever he had of generous instinct or of intellectual power he has sold to the haughtiest and most heartless of parties. His style is exceedingly artificial, and its occasional gorgeousness artificial, its frequent antithesis still more artificial, and its general simplicity most artificial, so that nothing can be less simple than its simplicity. Macaulay is a corruptor of style, though, too busy in thinking how he is to be still more a slave of the Whigs to be intentionally a corruptor of style. As William III, that dull Dutchman, quite fulfills his notions of greatness, so the mediocrities of Queen Anne's days absolutely respond to his ideas of literary perfection, and them he takes for models. God, of course, made the universe for Whig kings, Whig patricians, Whig statesmen, Whig scribblers, for Lord John Russell, Lord Grey, Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay."

ELEMENTS OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY, designed for Academies and High Schools.  
By ELIAS LOOMIS, LL. D. 350 pages. 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers.  
1858. New Haven: E. Downes.

Whatever Prof. Loomis undertakes to do, he is sure to do well. A knowledge of the primary elements of Algebra, Geometry and Plane Trigonometry is all that



is requisite in the study, as here presented, of the leading principles of *Mechanics* and *Physics*. It is a thorough treatise, as far as it goes; and gives information of the recent discoveries in the various branches of *Physical Science*.

**CATALOGUE OF YALE COLLEGE. 1858-9.**

In this College there are *twenty-eight* professorships, and in all *forty-one* instructors. There are in all 580 students in the various departments, divided as follows: In *Theology*, 21; *Law*, 33; *Medicine*, 34; *Philosophy and Arts*, 36; *Seniors*, 104; *Juniors*, 112; *Sophomores*, 106; *Freshmen*, 134. New York furnishes 145 Students; Canada 2; West Indies 2; Chili 1; Mexico 1; Turkey 4; Syria 1; Sandwich Islands 1.

**CALENDAR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD, CT. 1858-9.**

From this catalogue it appears that there are now in Trinity College *fifty-six* students; viz: ten *Seniors*; twelve *Juniors*; twenty-one *Sophomores*; thirteen *Freshmen*. Feeble as this College is in point of numbers, we cannot doubt that an auspicious future is yet before it.

**NEW TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, by LEICESTER A. SAWYER. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1858.**

We should regard this new Translation as beneath notice and almost beneath contempt, except for the numbers of our Clergy and others who have been decoyed into buying it by the personal solicitations of the author; whose modesty and capacity for such a work, are evidently about equal. There are also some other reasons for examining this New Translation, of a more general character, and we shall devote a little attention to it in our next Number.

**CHRISTIANITY NEITHER ASCETIC NOR FANATIC. A Sermon preached in Trinity Church, New Haven. By the Rev. D. R. GOODWIN, D.D., President of Trinity College. Published by request. New Haven: 1858.**

The distinction between Christianity as the foundation of all true reform, and as a mere system of reform, a distinction fundamental in itself, and distinguishing the Church from the motley hosts of the Sects now-a-days, we never saw so clearly stated. Indeed, its positions are so self-evident, and so logically put, that the shallow "thinkers" of the day seem to have agreed to give it the go-by, as the most convenient method of getting rid of it. Once, such a Sermon as this at Trinity Church, New Haven, would have been the signal for a general onset. Now, alas for Puritanism!

**THE REVIVAL SYSTEM AND THE PARACLETE. A Series of Articles from the Church Journal. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. 1858. 12mo. pp. 90.**

There is in these Articles a breadth of historic treatment of this whole subject of the Revival System, and withal a vein of good sense, which can hardly fail to be of good service to Churchmen, to whom practically the subject is one of great importance.

**THE REV. C. D. JACKSON'S SERMON before the New York Convention, in St. John's Chapel, New York City, Sept. 29, 1858. "The Mystical Body; The Orders therein; their Unity and Service."**

A thoughtful discourse on the Ministerial element as a principle of the divine economy in the Mystical Body of Christ. The Christian Ministry is thus seen in its true place; and its duties, motives, and encouragements, &c., are forcibly presented.



**CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS AT CEDAR GROVE.** By Mrs. WILLIAM WOOD SEYMOUR, Author of "Easter Holidays at Cedar Grove." New York: D. Dana, Jr. 1858. 12mo. pp. 243.

This beautiful story of Mrs. Seymour is full of the mirthful sports and joyous glee of the Christmas Holidays, tempered and chastened, however, by a refined and true Christian sentiment. The author has also interwoven into her story much curious information as to the customs of our British and Saxon and Norman ancestors in their celebration of the Christmas and other Festivals; and much instruction as to the doctrines and duties of our holy Religion.

**REV. H. B. WHIFFLE'S CONVENTION SERMON**, in St. Paul's, Springfield, Ill., on "The Ministry."

A noble, frank, faithful lifting up of a great truth to its proper position; a Sermon admirably adapted to the occasion and to the times.

**REV. DR. S. R. JOHNSON'S SERMON** at the Consecration of St. John's Church, Lafayette, Ind., July 29, 1858. "The Champion Church."

An affectionate appeal from a former Pastor, breathing a spirit of the truest fidelity to the Church.

**REV. C. T. QUINTARD'S Plain Tract** on Confirmation, for Parochial Use. New York: D. Dana, Jr. 1858. 12mo. pp. 32.

The Rector of the Church of the Advent, in Nashville, Tenn., has presented the argument for Confirmation and the nature of that Apostolic rite, most clearly and satisfactorily. It is a good Tract for distribution.

**MIXED SOCIETIES.** Reprinted from the Oct. No. of the American Quarterly Church Review.

There has been so much call for the reprint of this Article, and from all parts of the Church, that we are glad to announce it as in press, and soon to be issued.

**MR. JAS. ROBINSON** (of Baltimore) has also in press, "THOUGHTS ON THE SERVICES; or Meditations before Worship." By A. C. COXE, D. D.



# ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

## SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

### ORDINATIONS.

#### DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Bliss, Joshua I.	Hopkins,	Sept. 15,	St. Paul's, Burlington, Vt.
Cheney, C. E.	DeLancey,	Nov. 21,	Trinity, Utica, W. N. Y.
Edwards, ———,	Bowman,	Sept. 16,	Trinity, Pottsville, Penn.
Godfrey, G. W.	Potter, H.	Nov. 3,	Trinity, New York City.
Heaton, Wm. Smith,	Bowman,	Oct. 13,	St. Luke's, Altoona, Penn.
Hyland, Peter E.	Potter, H.	Oct. 3,	St. Peter's, New York City.
Jarratt, James S.	Cobb,	Nov. 7,	St. John's, Montgomery, Ala.
Roberts, William,	DeLancey,	Nov. 21,	Trinity, Utica, W. N. Y.
Sleeper, T. D.	DeLancey,	Nov. 21,	Trinity, Utica, W. N. Y.
Saunders, Joseph S.	Doane,	Sept. 19,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Smith, Cornelius B.	Williams,	Dec. 19,	St. Paul's, New Haven, Ct.
Waddill, John C.	Cobb,	Nov. 7,	St. John's, Montgomery, Ala.
Widdemer, E. S.	Potter, H.	Oct. 3,	St. Peter's, New York City.
Wharton, L. B.	Meade,	Nov. 24,	St. Paul's, Lynchburg, Va.
White, ———,	Bowman,	Sept. 16,	Trinity, Pottsville, Penn.

#### PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Beaven, J. F.	Whittingham,	Sept. 19,	Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, Md.
" Brewer, A. L.	Williams,	Nov. 14,	Christ, Norwich, Ct.
" Burton, G. J.	Bowman,	Sept. 21,	St. Peter's, Philadelphia, Penn.
" Chase, Francis,	Chase,	Sept. 12,	St. Andrew's, Hopkinton, N. H.
" Cromlish, John,	Bowman,	Oct. 15,	Trinity, Pittsburgh, Penn.
" DeCosta, Benj. F.	Eastburn,	Sept. 29,	St. John's, Charlestown, Mass.
" Esch, John Frederick,	Upfold,	Oct. 6,	St. James', Vincennes, Indiana.
" Fogg, Thomas B.	Williams,	Nov. 5,	St. Paul's, Central Village, Ct.
" Gierlow, John,	Green,	Oct. 8,	Christ, Holly Springs, Miss.
" Goodwin, E. H. C.	Whittingham,	Sept. 19,	Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, Md.
" Gorham, W. O.	DeLancey,	Nov. 21,	Trinity, Utica, W. N. Y.
" Hopkins, Wm. C.	Hopkins,	Sept. 29,	St. Michael's, Brattleboro, Vt.
" Jessup, Louis Y.	Kemper,	Oct. 17,	St. John's, Milwaukee, Wis.
" Johnson, Wm. Allen,	DeLancey,	Oct. 31,	St. John's, Whitestown, W. N. Y.
" Lewis, Robert W.	Bowman,	Oct. 23,	Meadville, Penn.
" Lee, R. H., LL. D.	Bowman,	Oct. 30,	Washington, Penn.
" Osborne, J. W.	Whitehouse,	Sept. 29,	St. John's, Chicago, Ill.
" Potter, Henry,	Bowman,	Oct. 15,	Trinity, Pittsburgh, Penn.
" Rogers, Silas M.	Hopkins,	Sept. 29,	St. Michael's, Brattleboro, Vt.
" Shipman, J. S.	DeLancey,	Nov. 21,	Trinity, Utica, W. N. Y.
" Smith, Thomas,	Kemper,	Oct. 17,	St. John's, Milwaukee, Wis.
" Synnott, S. H.	Potter, H.	Oct. 3,	St. Peter's, New York City.
" Van Antwerp, A. R.	DeLancey,	Nov. 21,	Trinity, Utica, W. N. Y.
" Welles, Edward R.	DeLancey,	Sept. 12,	St. Paul's, Waterloo, W. N. Y.



## CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Christ,	Green,	Oct. 7,	Holly Springs, Miss.
Christ,	Potter, H.	Oct. 26,	Marlboro, N. Y.
Christ,	Burgess,	Nov. 10,	Eastport, Maine,
Christ,	Bowman,	Oct. 28,	Gap Mines Mission, Penn.
Free Chapel of Trinity	McCoskry,	Nov. 4,	Cleveland, Ohio.
Church Home,			
Gethsemane,	DeLancey,	Nov. 1,	Hampton, W. N. Y.
Holy Apostles,	Bowman,	Sept. 15,	Pottsville, Penn.
St. John,	Lee, A.	Nov. 3,	Brandywine Village, Del.
St. Paul's,	Kemper,	Nov. 7,	Leavenworth City, Kansas Territory.
St. Paul's Chapel,	Whittingham,	Oct. 28,	Hillsborough, Md.
Trinity,	Doane,	Oct. 3,	Hoboken, N. J.
Trinity,	Potter, H.	Oct. 20,	Granville, N. Y.
Trinity,	Upfold,	Oct. 27,	Michigan City, Indiana.

## OBITUARY.

## DEATH OF THE RT. REV. HENRY USTICK ONDERDONK, D. D.

The Rt. Rev. HENRY U. ONDERDONK, D. D., died at Philadelphia, Penn., on Monday, Dec. 6th, in the 70th year of his age. A faithful sketch of the life and character of this distinguished man may be expected in our next Number.

DIED, in Beloit Wisconsin, October 10th, in the 91st year of his age, the Rev. AARON HUMPHREY, more than fifty years a Presbyterian of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Mr. H. was born in the neighborhood of Gardiner, Me, his parents having removed thither from Weymouth Mass. In 1809, Rev. Samuel Haskell resigned the Rectorship of the Episcopal Church in Gardiner, and there being no other place of worship at that time in the town, some of the citizens engaged Mr. Humphrey, who was then connected with the Methodist denomination, to preach for a year in the school house, near the Church. The Episcopal society, finding Mr. Humphrey's services to be very acceptable to the people, and not being able to procure a successor to Mr. Haskell, engaged Mr. Humphrey to officiate in the Church the following year. The invitation was renewed in 1811, when the parish passed a vote to request Bishop Griswold to admit Mr. Humphrey to orders, and he was ordained in the course of the year.

Soon after entering the Church, he officiated for some years in the Diocese of Connecticut; was Rector of St. Luke's, Lanesboro, from the year 1820 to 1830, when he removed into the Diocese of New York. After serving, for some time, the Parishes of Waddington and Ogdensburg, he organized a Parish at Beloit, Wisconsin, and was the pioneer Missionary in that region, at an age beyond the allotted time of life.

He was an excellent preacher, a firm and consistent Churchman, and an exemplary Christian. His declining years were made comfortable by the provision of the Diocese of New York, (with which he was connected up to the time of his death,) for aged Clergymen. He leaves a widow aged 89, a son to fill his place in the ministry, and a family reaching to the fourth generation. "The end of that man is peace."

DIED, in Salisbury, N. C., on the 15th of September, of disease of the brain, the Rev. J. H. PARKER, Rector of St. Luke's Church, in his 46th year. He was born January 21st, 1813, in Tarboro'; and graduated at Chapel Hill, in 1832, with the first distinction. He was a delegate to the General Protestant Episcopal Convention, from Alabama, in 1840. In 1846, he was ordained Deacon, and the next year Presbyterian. After preaching a short time in the Churches in the neigh-



boring country, he succeeded the Rev. Thomas F. Davis, (now Bishop of South Carolina,) as Rector of St. Luke's Church, Salisbury.

In the words of an older Clergyman, "he was of that character so necessary to the true prosperity of the Church, of unblemished morals;" but, this must be understood of his whole life, and not merely of its ministerial portion. At the mature age of thirty-three, in the possession of a competent estate, and thus with the prospect of having temporal enjoyment in his power, he devoted himself to the self-sacrificing duties of a Minister of the Gospel; and, his flock can tell, at least in part, with what fidelity. He often declared that the office was the noblest man could aspire to on earth. St. Luke's Parish was his first and only settled charge. He loved his work, and he loved his flock; and their affection and sympathy was the present reward and delight, without which, he felt he could not live. Such was his sensibility, that those feelings towards himself called forth from others by his kindness and hospitality, were construed by him as favors received and obligation to gratitude on his part. If his temper was quick and warm, it was destitute of malice; and certainly he was a man eminently sincere and without guile. His preaching was esteemed practical, earnest, and spiritual. His intercourse with his people was familiar and affectionate; and the consistency with which he maintained his views of the Church did not prevent, we trust, a warm charity for all his brother Christians. He had a free and cordial bearing towards all his fellow men, and it is believed, was highly valued by the whole community as a citizen, a friend, and a Minister. What he was as a devoted husband, as a father, son, and brother, only those can know who have been deeply bereaved. The poor, the afflicted and distressed, knew him at every appeal. We know the Church has been bereaved of a zealous and trusted Minister.

DIED, on Sunday, September 19th, the Rev. WILLIAM RICHMOND, Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York, in the 61st year of his age.

Mr. Richmond was born in Dighton, Mass., on the 11th of December, 1797. Receiving his early education among the Congregationalists, he entered upon a course of study, preparatory for the Bar. While yet a youth, at Union College, his attention being drawn to the claims of our Church, he was baptized in St. George's, Schenectady, and, animated by the same zeal and promptness which ever gave life to his character, obeyed, at once, the voice calling him to the Holy Ministry, as his post of greatest usefulness. Trained for that sacred calling under the direction of Bishop Hobart, he was ordained by that Prelate in December, 1819, and has had the charge successively of Zion, St. James', St. Michael's, and St. Mary's parishes, in New York city.

The first eighteen months of his ministry were given to Missionary work in the vicinity of Philadelphia, of Pittsburgh, and in the State of Ohio. In the Spring of 1820, he was called to the Rectorship of St. Michael's Church, Bloomingdale, and St. James', Hamilton Square, (vacant by the resignation of Dr. Jarvis,) and entered upon his duties in the Summer of the same year. He continued, with a short intermission, Rector of St. Michael's Church, until called to his rest.

It was as Rector of these Churches, that Mr. Richmond, for many years, was moved to labors requiring more than common strength and faith, and in which he was sustained by the Divine Providence, and by the liberal hands and faithful hearts of those who were about him. Taught by his Master to be ever ready with sympathy and aid for suffering men, his daily work was to carry comfort to the sick and sorrowing, and, so far as was in his power, the needed aid to every stricken brother. He had also for many years given his most willing and untiring labors to the New York Orphan Asylum and to other benevolent institutions of that city, where his work will always be held in grateful remembrance.

Throughout his whole ministry he has been an interested and active member of the General Board of Missions. During his Rectorship of Zion Church, in the city of New York, his care of the spiritually destitute was manifested in the system organized for visiting among the poor, by which, with the aid of members of the Parish, the



destitute and outcast (the number thus visited being at one time 1600) were taught by Christian deeds of love that Christ's presence is yet blessing the world.

In the winter of 1850, he offered himself for the Oregon Mission, with the purpose, if his strength allowed, to give to it the closing portion of his life. The exposure and deprivation of the Missionary work in Oregon, were too great for his years, so that after striving for awhile almost against hope, he returned to the scene of his former labors, suffering under the disease which at last cut short his days.

Upon his return he undertook, as before, much extra parochial labor. Little by little, he was forced, however, owing to his failing strength, to commit the work to other hands. His services in the public institutions, one by one, were given up. His daily prayer, at the House of Mercy, established by Mrs. Richmond, and which was to him as his own child, became an occasional service, and then altogether ceased. At length, on the first Sunday in June, in the celebration of his Master's dying love, he met for the last time in Church the members of his flock. From that time until the day of his death he sank rapidly in body, looking trustfully and hopefully forward as one redeemed by Christ, to the near coming of his Lord.

The few closing days of his life were days of great suffering. The last service in which he had strength to join, was the celebration, in his sick room, of the Holy Communion. Perhaps the last earthly sound which fell upon his ear was the stroke of the bell, summoning the people of his charge to pray that the Great Shepherd of the sheep would be with their teacher and leader in the hour of his need. As they returned with sadness to their homes, his spirit left its ruined tabernacle of flesh, for its blessed rest in the bosom of Christ.

After his funeral, resolutions were passed by the Clergy present, as a testimony to the worth of their departed friend and brother.

DIED, at Dover, New Hampshire, October 16th, the Rev. GEORGE E. HURD, Deacon, aged 28 years. Mr. Hurd was ordained Deacon by Bishop Chase, July 6, 1856. His health, which has been failing for two years past, prevented his labor in the work to which he had devoted his life. He was a young man of great excellence of character, and gave promise of eminent usefulness in that holy profession, to which his whole heart was given.

DIED, at Fredericksburg, Virginia, Oct. 8, the Rev. EDWARD C. MCGUIRE, D. D., Rector of St. George's Church in that city.

Dr. McGuire was born in the ancient borough of Winchester, in the year 1793. In the year 1813, the Church at Fredicksburg having no minister he officiated as lay reader for one year, when he was ordained Deacon, being then barely twenty years of age. Since that time, for the long space of forty-five years, he has been Rector of the same Church.

The abundant and extensive fruits of his long ministry, testify to the expediency of permanence in the pastoral relation, his congregation having greatly increased in numbers and in all their higher spiritual interests under his faithful culture. He has discharged his high office as an ambassador from God through those long years in three different church edifices, and to as many successive generations of Christian worshipers. The whole of the present generation in his own communion he has baptized, the whole of the past generation he has buried, until at last he has left the world growing stranger in the ceaseless flow of change, to find himself far more at home where the friends and parishioners of his early life had gathered before him.

His funeral was numerously attended, and, besides many Presbyters, Bishop Johns of his own Diocese, and Bishop Otey of Tenn., attended to do him honor.

DIED, at Leesburg, Virginia, November 25th, the Rev. DAVID CALDWELL, M. A., Rector of St. James' Church, Shelbourn Parish, in the 44th year of his age.

Mr. Caldwell was a native of Bennington, Vermont, but removed in very early life to Virginia, and was ordained in Alexandria, in 1841, by the Venerable Bishop Moore.



The seeds of disease were early sown in his system, but for 17 years, though frail and delicate in frame, his zeal knew no abatement and he labored faithfully and successfully in his Master's cause. He was for a time Rector of St. Paul's Church, Norfolk, and some two years since, succeeded in the Rectorship of St. James', Leesburg, the late Rev. George Adie. Recently he had been preparing a series of Lectures on the Psalms, and had put the first volume in the hands of his publishers at Philadelphia, but it was not the will of God, that he should remain to complete his labor. At his own request his remains were removed to Richmond for burial.

DIED, in Charleston, South Carolina, September 28th, of Yellow Fever, the Rev. HENRY MANDEVILLE DENISON, Rector of St. Peter's Church.

Mr. Denison was born July 29th, 1822, at Kingston, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania. His grandfather was Col. Nathan Denison, one of the sturdy old pioneers who emigrated from Hartford, Conn., to the beautiful valley of Wyoming, and was distinguished as an officer in the Continental War with the British and Indians of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Denison was a graduate of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, where at the early age of 16 he became interested in the great truths of the gospel, and united himself with the Church.

He studied theology at Alexandria, Virginia, entering that institution in 1840, and graduating in July, 1844, in which month he was ordained Deacon by Bishop Meade. His first fields of labor in the ministry were in Greenville and Pendleton, South Carolina. He was afterwards, for some time, Rector of Bruton Parish, Williamsburgh, Va., and from thence removed to Brooklyn, New York, where he became assistant minister to Dr. Stone, for one year. Subsequently he became Rector of St. Paul's Church, Louisville, Kentucky, where he remained till the fall of 1857, when he was called to succeed his friend and fellow student in the Theological Seminary, the Rev. J. A. Shanklin, as Rector of St. Peter's Church, Charleston. Mr. Shanklin had died, while at his post, of the prevailing fever, in 1856.

His first summer in Charleston was a season long to be remembered for its fearful mortality, and in less than a year after entering upon his charge, and while in the full maturity of his cultivated powers, his promising career was thus suddenly brought to a close, by this terrible disease.

As a preacher of the Gospel, Mr. Denison occupied a prominent position in the Church. He generally preached without notes. His written sermons usually evinced great mental power, as well as literary excellence. An Address before the Alumni of Dickinson College, a volume controverting the position of the Unitarians, and a volume of discourses to business men, are the only productions of his pen of any magnitude that have been published.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. J. P. T. COOLIDGE, formerly a prominent preacher among the Unitarians at Boston, has renounced the errors of that sect, and is now a candidate for Holy Orders in the Church.

A Meeting of the "CHARITY FOUNDATION," of Buffalo, N. Y., was held in St. Paul's Church, Oct. 5, 1858. The Rev. Dr. SHELTON was appointed Chairman; and JAMES MURDOCK SMITH, Esq., Secretary. After Prayers by the Chairman, an Address was delivered by the Hon. GEO. W. CLINTON, President of the Foundation; after which, remarks were made by the Rev. Dr. INGERSOLL, the Rev. W. B. ASHLEY, and the Rev. Dr. SHELTON. The concluding Prayers and the Benediction, were by the Rev. Mr. ASHLEY.

#### TREATIES WITH CHINA.

The Four Treaties between China and the Four Powers were signed at Tientsin, on the 26th of June. Among the important provisions of these Treaties, are the following:



By the various treaties eleven new ports are open to foreign vessels, including one in Hainan, two in Formosa, one in Shantung Province, and one at the head of the Gulf of Pecheli and Swa-taw.

The Yang-tsze-kiang is to be opened as far as Chin-kiang, a town near the junction of the Grand Canal, and about 150 miles from the sea.

Foreigners are to be allowed to travel, for trade or for pleasure, to all undisturbed parts of the Empire, and boats and men may be freely hired anywhere, for the conveyance of baggage or merchandise. Passports are to be granted by the Consuls of the Treaty-Powers, and are to protect the bearers from molestation of all sorts.

The Christian Religion is to be tolerated throughout the Empire, and its professors, and its teachers, are to be protected.

The Treaties also provide for the mutual appointment and the residence of diplomatic agents, Ambassadors, Ministers, Consuls, &c., on terms of equality.

#### AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

The following extracts are from the *New York Observer*:

"St. Louis, Nov. 17, 1858.

"Thirty years ago, this day, the writer left the city of New York to visit the principal cities of the West. A tedious stage ride of six days brought him to Pittsburgh. Thence he descended the Ohio river to Marietta, Cincinnati, and Louisville, spending from one to four weeks in each city, and reached St. Louis in April, 1829.

"This city numbered then between three and four thousand souls. Now the population is estimated at 150,000. Great has been the change. The city is now nearly equal to what New York was at that time. Should it increase in the same ratio for thirty years to come, its population would exceed a million. It is destined to become an immense city filled with churches, schools, and benevolent and humane institutions.

"For some years it has been the head quarters of one of the agencies of the American Tract Society, embracing Missouri, Southern and Central Illinois and Iowa. In these States, for the last ten years, the Society has employed from thirty to sixty colporteurs per annum; about one-third of them Germans. They have circulated \$150,000 worth of the Society's publications among the scattered population. Their influence has been manifest.

"A Convention of some twenty of these humble laborers, including the Superintendents at St. Louis and Chicago, with two General Agents and two of the Secretaries from New York, has been in session in this city for a few days past. It was opened on Thursday evening the 11th, by an excellent sermon from Rev. Mr. Porter of the Union Church of this city, from the text—"He that winneth souls is wise;" and organized by appointing Rev. Dr. J. M. Stevenson, President.

"The Convention met on Friday morning at nine o'clock, in the lecture room of the Second Presbyterian Church, Rev. Mr. Brooks'. Its sessions continued Friday, Saturday, and Monday, and were occupied in hearing narratives from the members, of the dealings of God with them, and of the fields where they had labored, and in discussing the principles of the society, and in making suggestions for the mutual benefit and usefulness of all present in carrying out the designs of the Society.

"On the Sabbath, the pulpits of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Congregational Churches were opened to the Secretaries and Agents of the Society, and on Sabbath evening, two public Union meetings were held, and addressed by the members of the Convention and the pastors of the Churches."

The same mail gives us notice that the late *Bishop Ives* is about commencing a course of Lectures in St. Louis, Mo.

The two items of news are not without their mutual relations.



## SOCIETY FOR THE INCREASE OF THE MINISTRY.

This Society, recently organized, and whose general object is sufficiently indicated by its title, has published its Constitution, and its Managers have issued an Address, both which, doubtless, our readers have already seen. The following is its list of Officers:

**PATRONS.**—Rt. Rev. T. C. Brownell, D. D., LL. D., Rt. Rev. J. H. Hopkins, D. D., LL. D., Rt. Rev. J. Williams, D. D., Rt. Rev. T. M. Clark, D. D.

**OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY.**\*—*President*, Samuel Eliot, Hartford.

*Vice Presidents*, Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D., LL. D., Troy, Rev. A. C. Coxe, D. D., Baltimore, Rev. A. H. Vinton, Boston, Rev. E. M. P. Wells, D. D., Boston, Rev. W. S. Child, Springfield, Rev. C. F. McRae, Philadelphia, J. B. Robertson, M. D., New Haven, G. C. Shattuck, M. D., Boston, G. S. Wardwell, Esq., Woonsocket.

*Recording Secretary*, Rev. C. R. Fisher, Hartford.

*Corresponding Secretaries*, Rev. A. B. Goodrich, Millville, Mass., Rev. S. F. Jarvis, Thompsonville, Ct.

*Treasurer*, Charles M. Beach, Esq., Hartford.

*Board of Directors*, The President ex-officio Chairman, Rev. A. Jackson, D. D., Geneva, N. Y., Rev. F. J. Goodwin, D. D., Middletown, Ct., Rev. R. M. Abercrombie, Hartford, Ct., Rev. E. A. Washburn, Hartford, Ct., J. C. Hollister, Esq., New Haven, Ct., J. B. Stebbins, Esq., Springfield, Mass.

*Local Secretaries appointed by the Board*, Rev. J. A. Bolles, D. D., Cleveland, O., Hon. N. B. Baker, Clinton, Iowa, Rev. S. Benedict, New Haven, Ct., Rev. D. R. Brewer, Newport, R. I., Henry Chauncey, Jr., Esq., New York, Rev. H. A. Coit, Concord, N. H., Rev. T. T. Guion, Brooklyn, N. Y., Rev. L. H. Jones, Anderson, Texas, Rev. B. H. Paddock, Norwich, Ct.

All that the Society needs to accomplish its ends, is some practicable plan which shall give expression to a widely pervading and deep sympathy in the Church on the subject.

## NATURAL EFFECTS OF RADICALISM IN THE CHURCH.

We find the following paragraph in a late (Romish) "*Freeman's Journal*," of New York. We copy it, and comment upon it, because it contains a moral of the greatest significance. We affirm unhesitatingly and most confidently, that low and loose views of the Church, that a theoretical, practical, ignoring, and disparaging of Institutions which CHRIST Himself, through His Inspired Apostles, established, can never satisfy minds which yearn for, and which *will have*, a positive, fixed, authoritative Faith of some sort. We know certainly, and of our own personal observation, that the loose views held in certain quarters respecting the Visible Church, its Apostolic Ministry, and Sacraments, have driven men over into the Romish Church. We can give names, places, and dates. This ultra-Protestantism, with all its pretensions, is doing more than any other one thing to play into the hands of the Roman communion. But here is the paragraph.

"The Rev. Father Grace, at Memphis, Tenn., had the pleasure, on the 1st ult., to receive into the Catholic Church Dr. William P. Floyd, youngest son of the late Gov. Floyd, of Virginia. Among all the remarkable conversions to the faith in our country, we do not know a parallel to that of this family, in regard to the number of converts that it has afforded. Miss Letitia P. Floyd, now Mrs. Col. Lewis, of Virginia, was the first, and her gifted and venerable mother, whose obituary we published a few years ago, was the last, so far as we had heard; but the sum total of converts from this immediate family connection has been some twenty-five."

---

\*The list is yet very incomplete.



## ROMISH MISSIONS AND MISSIONARIES.

In a paper published at Worcester, Mass., we find the following statement, which we give with all its phraseology:

"For ten days past four Catholic Priests, from an organization of Clergymen styled 'The Congregation of Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle,' have been engaged in giving religious instruction and hearing confessions at the Cathedral on Broad street. The names of these gentlemen are I. T. Hecker, A. F. Hewitt, George Deshon and Francis A. Baker. They are all men of marked ability and liberal education. Rev. Messrs. Hewitt and Baker were formerly Episcopal Clergymen, and were converted to the Romish faith some fourteen years since. Rev. Mr. Deshon is the son of an Episcopal Clergyman of some distinction, residing in Bridgeport, Conn. He was educated at West Point, where he afterwards became a professor of moral philosophy. Rev. I. T. Hecker is probably the ablest of the four, and is known to the literary world as the author of two very profound volumes connected with the moral present and the moral future of man.

"These gentlemen style themselves Missionaries—and belong to an organization established in 1851, with a view to the more vigorous prosecution of the missions and other works of the Apostolic ministry, in which, as a body, they have been engaged since the founding of the Society. Since April, 1851, when their labors commenced, they have given religious instruction in the Dioceses of Baltimore, New York, Cincinnati, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Boston, Pittsburgh, Albany, Brooklyn, Lewisville, Newark, Detroit, Charleston, Mobile, Richmond, Savannah, Buffalo, Wheeling, Cleveland, Erie, Burlington, Florida, and Hartford. Missions have been given in eighteen Cathedrals, and in sixty-six Parish Churches. The whole number of missions has been eighty-eight, and the whole number of communicants 173,000. The following is the main plank in the platform upon which they operate:

"We devote ourselves and all our energies as long as we live to this work, (missionary instruction.) Renouncing all expectation of worldly profit or advantage, we look only to the glory of God and the salvation of souls. We ask nothing for ourselves, but we confidently expect that the piety of the faithful will furnish us all that may be required for this great purpose. Those who contribute to its success will share in the merit of all the labors of the Institute, (organization.) The Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary will be recited for them every day in community; and at stated times the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass will be offered up for them while they are living, or for the repose of their souls when they are dead."

"The missionaries have been, for seven years past, travelling through various parts of the Union in the different Dioceses, and their preaching has been usually attended by thousands of the 'faithful' at each place. They labor incessantly, commencing at an early hour in the morning, and continuing until a late hour in the evening. At 5 o'clock, A. M., they say mass, a sermon follows at 5½, mass again at 6. The remainder of the day, except what is absolutely necessary for physical requirements, is devoted to religious instruction and the hearing of confessions. These last are very numerous, and keep the fathers exceedingly busy."

## CHEAP POSTAGE.

For some reason a strong determination is still persisted in to saddle the country with heavy taxation on letters and periodicals. The whole difficulty lies in the enormous amount of matter which now passes free under the Franking System. In point of fact, instead of there being a "deficiency," as officially reported at the close of each fiscal year, the Government owes the Post Office more than twenty millions of dollars for transporting mail matter during the last fifteen years, in addition to all the appropriations made for deficiencies, and on account of the Government correspondences, during the same period. Instead of



compelling this people to bear the burden, and then doling out jeremiads because the people are not fleeced close enough, let the Government pay its own postage. Why should the Department be compelled to carry so unjust a burden? As well compel it to transport our soldiers with their equipments, arms and ordnance, gratuitously, as to load it down, uncompensated, with the grains of the Patent Office, and the letters, libraries and wardrobes of Congress. Let us have a reduction and uniformity of charge, thus diminishing the expense of the system, and increasing correspondence.

#### HEATHENISH SYMBOLS IN THE CAPITOL.

The *National Intelligencer*, in giving an account of the *improvements* now making in the Capitol at Washington, uses the following language: "In the north wing, to be occupied by the Senate and its officers, several committee rooms are finished, and some are well advanced towards completion already. One now in hand is for the use of the Naval Committee of the Senate, and its ceiling and walls are being exceedingly tastefully and neatly frescoed and painted. Neptune, Amphitrite, the Tritons, and all the gods and goddesses of the deep find spirited representations somewhere on the walls of this unique room; the pannelings are taken up with wall pictures of several of the most noted of the naval victories and exploits performed under the American flag."

If, instead of associating the victories of the American Navy with the gods and goddesses of heathenism, the symbols of the Christian Religion had been introduced, what a hue and cry would have been raised all over the country, of "Puseyism and Popery"! Symbols are the natural language of the human heart, of the most rude and barbarous, as well as of the most thoroughly cultivated and refined. The above mortifying description of our National Capitol shows to what extent prejudice has corrupted popular taste.

#### ENDOWMENT OF THE ANDOVER CONGREGATIONAL SEMINARY.

At the recent Semi-Centennial Celebration the financial statement of the Treasurer, Rev. J. L. Taylor, showed the following facts respecting the endowment of the Seminary. There has been given for this purpose—

By Madame Phillips & Son, .....	\$20,000
" Samuel Abbott, .....	110,000
" William Bartlet, .....	160,000
" Moses Brown, .....	35,000
" John Norris and his wife, .....	40,000
" William Phillips, .....	10,000
" Miss Waldo, of Worcester, .....	15,000
" S. H. Hitchcock, (recently,) .....	15,000
From other sources, .....	45,000

Making a total of 450,000. If to this be added the endowment of Phillips Academy, we have the sum of FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS, contributed to establish and sustain the Institutions on Andover Hill.

#### PROFESSING CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SLAVE POPULATION.

We find the following table in the papers of the day, and preserve it for reference, without vouching for its entire accuracy. It is probably nearly correct.

Connected with the Methodist South, are .....	200,000
Methodist North, Virginia and Maryland, .....	15,000
Missionary and Hard-Shell Baptists, .....	175,000
Old School Presbyterians, .....	12,000
New School Presbyterians, supposed .....	8,000
Cumberland Presbyterians, .....	20,000
Protestant Episcopalians, .....	7,000
Campbellites, or Christian, .....	10,000
All other sects combined, .....	20,000

Total colored membership South, .....

465,000



## SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

## ENGLAND.

## ERECTION OF NEW COLONIAL BISHOPRICS.

The Queen has been pleased to direct that letters patent be issued under the Great Seal for reconstituting the Bishopric of New Zealand, and for appointing the Right Rev. George Augustus Selwyn, D. D., to be Bishop of the said See, and Metropolitan of New Zealand; for erecting the Bishopric of Wellington, and for appointing the Venerable Charles John Abraham, Archdeacon of Waitemata, to be Bishop of the said See; for erecting the Bishopric of Waiapu, and for appointing the Venerable William Williams, Archdeacon of Waiapu, to be Bishop of the said See; for erecting the Bishopric of Nelson, and for appointing the Rev. Edmund Hobhouse, M. A., to be Bishop of the said See; and for placing under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of New Zealand the See of Christ Church, now under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Australia. Hitherto the Bishop of Sydney has acted as Metropolitan over the diocese of New Zealand; but that authority will henceforward be transferred to the Bishop of New Zealand, the Bishops of Christ Church, Nelson, Wellington, and Waiapu, being his suffragans. It is in contemplation to erect a sixth Bishopric for the colony, the seat of which will be at Tauranga, another Maori district. It is expected that the consecration of the new Bishop of Waiapu will take place in the colony.

## CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOPS OF NELSON AND WELLINGTON.

On Wednesday, Sept. 29th, the Festival of St. Michael and All Angels, the Rev. EDMUND HOBHOUSE, of Merton College, Oxford, Bishop-nominate of Nelson; and the Ven. CHARLES JOHN ABRAHAM, formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, Bishop-nominate of Wellington, were consecrated at Lambeth parish Church.

At eleven o'clock the procession, which had been formed at Lambeth Palace, entered the church by the west door. It consisted of the churchwardens of the parish, the curates in their surplices, Mr. Francis Hart Dyke, her Majesty's Proctor, the Bishops-nominate, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of London, Mr. Felix Knyvett, the secretary to the Archbishop, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Rev. J. Thomas, B. C. L., his Grace's chaplain, and Mr. J. Barber, the apparitor.

The Archbishops and Bishops went within the altar-rails, the Bishops-nominate, who were habited in their ordinary black academical gowns, having seats without. In the absence of the rector from illness, prayers were read by the Rev. C. L. Alexander, M. A., the senior curate of the parish; the Ante-Communion Service by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Epistle by the Bishop of Oxford, the Gospel by the Bishop of Lichfield, and the Nicene Creed by the Bishop of London. A most eloquent sermon was preached by the Bishop of Oxford, who selected for his text the 13th and 14th verses of the 1st chapter of St. Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy:—

"Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." It was a discourse full of primitive truth, faith, love, and unction; and such as fills one's heart with trust and confidence in God. There is in it no blustering cant about "*progress*;" yet it is full of the spirit of all true progress, for it is full of the truth as it is in Jesus.

The Bishop then descended from the pulpit and took his seat with the other prelates within the communion-rails. The Bishops-nominate, vested in their rochets, were then presented to the Archbishop—the Bishop of Wellington, Archdeacon Abraham, by the Bishop of London; and the Bishop of Nelson, the Rev. E. Hobhouse, by his diocesan, the Bishop of Oxford, each Bishop saying, "Most Reverend Father in God, we present unto you this godly and well-learned man to be ordained and consecrated Bishop."



The Queen's mandate for the Consecration was then read, the oaths administered, and Archdeacon Abraham and Mr. Hobhouse were admitted to the Episcopate by the imposition of hands from the Primate and three Bishops. The Holy Eucharist was celebrated, a large number communicating; the Primate, five Bishops, and two curates officiating.

#### NEW DIOCESE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND THE NEW BISHOP.

The excitement caused by the rumored discovery of gold on Frazer's River, has led to the influx of a considerable population into that region; and the Venerable Propagation Society has determined to establish a Mission there immediately. The Rev. J. GAMMAGE, curate in Manchester, is selected as the first Missionary, and he was to sail from London, Oct. 15th. The same Society have appointed also, and sent out the Rev. R. DOWSON, a Missionary to the native Indian population of Van-Couver's Island. Miss BURDETT COURTS has offered 15,000*l.* towards an endowment of a Bishopric in British Columbia.

The Rev. GEORGE HILLS, of Great Yarmouth, has been designated as the new Bishop of British Columbia. We find in our exchanges the following sketch of his life:

"The Rev. George Hills, B. D., Bishop-designate of British Columbia, is the son of the late Admiral Hills, of Clare, Suffolk. He graduated with honors at the University of Durham, and having there passed a very high theological examination, was ordained Deacon, to Newburn on the Tyne, a Parish of miners and glass-blowers, under the spiritual care of the Rev. J. Reed. When in Priest's Orders, Mr. Hills was intrusted with the sole charge of the new Church of Tynemouth, which, under the influence of his house-to-house laboring and earnest preaching, soon became crowded. It was from this Parish Mr. Hills was invited to the important posts of lecturer of the Parish Church, and evening lecturer of St. John's Church, Leeds. In the year 1846, he was presented to the incumbency of St. Mary's, Leeds, a charge of 16,000 souls, and in 1848, Dean Pellew, thinking solely of the well-doing of a most important Parish, offered Mr. Hills the incumbency of Great Yarmouth, with a population of 28,000. There, aided by a staff of six curates, he has labored for ten years, to the blessing of a people by whom he is universally respected and beloved. Some idea of those labors may be formed when we consider that under the ministry of Mr. Hills the National Schools in St. Peter's district, the Priory Schools, and St. John's Church, for the beachmen, have been built at a cost of 8,000*l.*, a town mission of four Scripture-readers has been provided, and two of the Churches of the Parish opened for evening services. Mr. Hills has received many valuable testimonials of attachment from his several Parishes, and Dissenters have always gladly joined in expressing their respect for a Clergyman who, while he faithfully maintained the principles of the Church of England, was kind and tolerant to all men. Mr. Hills was remarkable, as a Proctor of Convocation, for his practical suggestions in the discussion of all matters connected with the parochial system of the Church."

It certainly shows that the English Church is not a sham, but a living power, when her best sons thus give up positions of great usefulness, and honor, and comparative comfort, for posts of hardship, and trial, and danger, to carry the Gospel and the Church of CHRIST. Thank God our own noble Bishops are already on the Pacific Coast to welcome the new Ambassador from the Mother Church.

#### TASMANIA.—CHURCH SYNOD.

In former Numbers of the Review we have recorded the movement in several of the English Colonial Churches towards the establishment of Diocesan Synods, or, as we should say, of Diocesan Conventions. We have before us an account of the doings of one of these Synods, a short abstract of which is as follows:

The Synod of Tasmania assembled on the 20th of July, and continued in session from day to day till the 2d of August. About thirty of the Clergy, and as many



or rather more Lay representatives (all necessarily communicants) were present; the Bishop, of course, presiding. By the constitution adopted last year, the Clergy and Laity debate together, voting either collectively, or (if desired by three members) by orders; and no measure can be carried without a majority of both Clergy and laity, and the Bishop's consent; or, in other words, without the concurrence of all the three orders.

The following were the principal matters that occupied the attention of the Synod during its twelve days' session. First, the draft of a bill to be laid before the local Parliament for legalizing the proceedings of the Synod, and making its acts binding upon the members of the Church. There was at first a little difference of opinion as to the necessity for this measure, but a general agreement as to its being, upon the whole, advisable; and the greater part of the provisions of the bill, declaring the constitution of the Synod, &c., were adopted unanimously. The clauses which were more anxiously debated were those which provided for the ecclesiastical tribunal for the trial of offenses against the doctrine or discipline of the Church; such tribunal to have the power of summoning before it any persons whomsoever, and in matters of fact (but not of doctrine) compelling their evidence. However, on the question being, at length, put, "that the clause do stand part of the bill," there were found—Ayes, clergy, 7; laity, 19. Noes, clergy, 19; laity, 10. The "compelling" clause was consequently struck out, and the tribunal to be established will now have power only to receive evidence upon oath, and to adjudicate if the evidence so obtained be sufficient.

But no question led to a more earnest discussion or a more decided division of opinion than that concerning *patronage*. Any effort for the more permanent maintenance of the Church was sure to involve the consideration of this question. A committee had been accordingly appointed to consider it, and their report was laid before the Synod and formed a basis for several resolutions. Some of the lay representatives were strongly in favor of the American system, that every congregation should, through an annually elected vestry, nominate its own pastor. Others of the laity joined with the great body of the Clergy in resisting the importation of such a system, with its attendant evils, into this diocese. At length, by a little mutual concession, the following plan was unanimously agreed to—that every parish should have liberty to elect annually a "Board of Patronage," of not less than seven members, all of whom must, however, be members of the Synod, either lay or clerical; such Board to exercise the right of patronage in the event of a vacancy in the cure during its year of office. Also that, to provide for cases in which parishes might neglect or decline to make this election, the Synod should itself elect a standing Board of Patronage, whose duty it should be to present to vacancies in all such cases. It was also resolved that wherever any persons should have built a Church or Parsonage at their own cost, provided partial endowments, or contributed largely to the Church funds, such persons might be enrolled by the Synod as benefactors to the Church, and have right of nominating in each case one additional member on the Board of Patronage. The Synod then proceeded to elect the standing board, votes being taken by ballot, and the choice fell upon the following persons:—The Ven. Archdeacon Davies, Rev. F. H. Cox, E. S. P. Bedford, Esq., H. Butler, Esq., W. Henty, Esq., Sir V. Fleming, and W. P. Weston, Esq. The five laymen thus chosen are the Chief Justice, the Colonial Secretary and another member of the Government, and two members of the Tasmanian Parliament; and the Board, as a whole, very fairly represents the whole body of the Church, containing within it influential men of various shades of opinion.

It should, perhaps, be explained that the "patronage" of all the principal cures of the diocese has hitherto been vested in the Crown, and exercised, in former days, by the Governor, who almost as a matter of course took the Bishop's recommendation; and more recently by the Ministry of the day, itself responsible to Parliament, and composed (it might be) of persons of any or no religious opinions, no one of whom was bound, however he might be personally disposed, to regard the Bishop's wishes in the matter. The change, therefore, which vests



such appointments in a body which must at least consist of selected communicant Churchmen, is clearly a gain.

The Synod did not separate without acknowledging their obligation to the Bishop for the unwearied attention which he had given to the business of the session, and for the value of his advice and assistance; at the same time expressing their thankfulness that, by the good providence of God, they had been enabled to take counsel together, in the spirit of brotherhood, and with so good ground of hope for the future welfare of the Church.

#### THE CONFESSIONAL IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

The "Boyn-Hill case," so called, or the Commission issued by the Bishop of Oxford to investigate charges against the Rev. R. T. West, Curate of the Rev. Mr. Gresley, in a district Church at Boyn-Hill, terminated in finding that there was not sufficient cause for instituting further proceedings against Mr. West; and the Bishop was so advised.

There is, undoubtedly, on the part of a few, among the English Clergy, a disposition to introduce the Confessional for purposes, and to an extent unauthorized by the standards of that Church. Nor is there any doubt, that, both in that Church, and our own, there needs to be far more of plain and faithful dealing with individual consciences than is now common. Both the Methodists, in their Class-Meetings, and the stricter Puritans, in their admission of members, press this matter of private confession, far more than we do, and beyond the limits of propriety or utility. But what we would protest against, is the making of Private Confession either an habitual thing, or of universal obligation in the Church; for it is a theory false in itself, and of evil tendency. It certainly has no authority in Holy Scripture, nor in the Early Church. We may be in danger of forgetting the awful corruptions which once grew, and grew naturally, out of this practice in the hands of the Romish priesthood. The record is astounding, both for the filthiness, and the schemes of villainy, and tyranny, of which it became the fruitful source. But this should not prevent that faithful probing of the individual conscience, on the part of the Clergy, of which we fear there is now too little in the Church; nor has this faithfulness of private dealing between the Pastor and his flock any necessary connection with the Romish doctrines of Private Confession and Judicial Absolution.

On this whole subject we have been interested in what the famous RICHARD BAXTER says, as follows:

"If you either fall into any grievous sin, or any terrible pangs of conscience, or any great straits and difficulties about matters of doctrine or practice, go presently to your minister for advice.

"You must use your Pastor as the ordained instrument and messenger of the Lord Jesus and His Spirit, appointed to speak a word in season to the weary, and to show to man His righteousness, and to strengthen the weak hands and feeble knees; yea, and more, to bind and loose on earth, as Christ doth bind and loose in Heaven.

"Not but that private men may help you in this, as a private neighbor may give you a medicine to cure your disease; but you will not so soon trust them in any weighty case, as you will the physician.

"The vomit of confession must work to the bottom, and fetch up that hidden sin, which is it that containeth your calamity.

"But I know some will say that it is near to Popish auricular confession which I here persuade Christians to, and it is to bring Christians under the tyranny of the Priests again, and make them acquainted with all men's secrets, and masters of their consciences.

"To the last, I say, to the railing devil of this age, no more but, *The Lord rebuke thee*. If any Minister have wicked ends, let the God of Heaven convert him, or root him out of His Church, and cast him among the weeds and briers. But is it not the known voice of sensuality and hell, to cast reproaches upon the way and ordinances of God?



"Some (Ministers) in opposition to Popery, have gone too far on the other extreme; perhaps sinning as deeply in neglect as the Papists do in formal excess."

The edition from which we quote is that in four volumes folio, entitled *The Practical Works of the late Reverend and Pious Mr. Richard Baxter*, London, 1707; and the treatise from which the extracts are made is in the Second Volume, pp. 846 sq. Neither do we quote Mr. Baxter as of the slightest authority; and we might easily cite other names in the same sentiment, and of greater weight. But we do it to show that, in our avoiding one extreme, we have, unwittingly, run into another, almost equally dangerous.

The Bishop of Oxford, in a letter to the Commissioners since their decision, thus distinctly states his opinion on the subject of Confession:

"As I have already stated in writing to Mr. Shaw, I hold it to be a part of the wisdom and tenderness of the Church of England that she provides for any parishioner who in sickness shall 'feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter' being 'moved to make special confession of his sins;' and that she also provides for those who before Holy Communion 'cannot quiet their own consciences,' being invited to 'open their grief to the minister of God's Word.' In making this special and limited provision for troubled souls, I hold that the Church of England discountenances any attempt on the part of her Clergy to introduce a system of habitual confession, or, in order to carry out such a system, to require men and women to submit themselves to the questioning and examination of the Priest. Such a system of inquiry into the secrets of hearts must, in my judgment, lead to innumerable evils. God forbid that our Clergy should administer, or that our wives and daughters should be subjected to it. I am sure that any attempt to introduce it would throw grievous difficulties in the way of that free ministerial intercourse with our people which, for their sakes and for the efficiency of our ministry, it is all-important to maintain open and unsuspected."

#### SCOTLAND.—REV. MR. CHEYNE.

The Scottish Episcopal Synod reassembled on Thursday, Nov. 4th, and gave judgment in the case of the Rev. Mr. Cheyne. Mr. Cheyne's teaching on the subject of the Lord's Supper was declared to be erroneous. A final deliverance was, however, delayed till December 2d, to give Mr. Cheyne time to retract. Bishops Eden, Wordsworth, and Trower, support this judgment; Bishop Forbes supports Mr. Cheyne's appeal. The passages in Mr. Cheyne's Sermons, which are most objectionable, are the following: When, having defined the Eucharistic presence in the following words, and pronounced it to be error to teach otherwise, he says, "'When I speak of the Real Presence, I mean as the Church means, that after consecration, Whole Christ, God and man, is really, truly, and substantially present in the Eucharist under the forms of bread and wine.'" When having laid down this definition—First, he declares that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is substantially the same as the sacrifice of the Cross, differing only in the manner of offering. Second, When he further declares that in the Lord's Supper 'we kneel to the Lord, Himself invisibly present under the form or under the veils of bread and wine.' And, lastly, when he pronounces that 'the only thing necessary to the completion of the sacrifice is the communion of the priest.'"

#### THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL LETTER AND THE UNBLOODY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

On the 3d of May, Pope Pius IX, having taken council of the Cardinals, issued an Encyclical Letter, which is worthy of attention. It seems that in "certain countries," certain Parish Priests have ceased to celebrate on certain holidays the "sacrifice of the Mass for the people." The object of this Letter is to set forth the Romish doctrine of the "Unbloody Sacrifice," and then he says, "that by our present letters, and in virtue of our supreme authority, we confirm and declare anew, we wish, command, and ordain, touching the obligation in which they are to apply the holy sacrifice of the Mass for those who are confided to them."



That part of the Letter in which the Pope, "in virtue of his supreme authority," sets forth the present teaching of that sect on the "Unbloody Sacrifice," we give entire. All intelligent Churchmen will be glad to see and preserve such an official and important statement.

#### ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE PIUS THE NINTH.

*To all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops and other Ordinaries of the Places in Communication with the Apostolic See.*

##### VENERABLE BRETHREN, HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION :

The goodness and charity of our most dearly beloved Redeemer, Jesus Christ, only Son of God, towards mankind, has been so great that you know, venerable brethren, having taken human nature, He desired not only to suffer for our salvation the most frightful torments and the horrible death of the cross, but still more, reascending to Heaven at the right hand of the Father, to dwell, meanwhile, with us in the august sacrament of His body and of His blood, and in the excess of His love to make it our food and our nourishment, for the purpose of being also our sustenance and our strength by the presence of His divinity, the most assured safeguard of spiritual life. And not content with this signal and altogether divine proof of charity, adding benefits to benefits, and spreading over us the riches of His love, He has wished to give us the full certainty that those whom He has loved He loved to the end. It is on that account, declaring Himself the eternal Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, He has instituted, in perpetuity, His priesthood in the Catholic Church and decreed that the sacrifice which He offered once by the effusion of His precious blood, on the altar of the cross, to redeem the entire human race, to deliver it from the yoke of sin and from the slavery of the devil, and to pacify all things in the Heavens and on the earth, shall be permanent unto the consummation of ages ; ordaining that this sacrifice, in which there is no change except in the manner of offering it, shall be made and offered each day by the ministry of the Priests in order to sow among men the fruits, sovereignly salutary and sovereignly fruitful, of His passion. Thus in the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass, accomplished by the noble ministry of the Priests, is offered this same victim, the source of life, who has reconciled us to God the Father, and who, having all virtue to merit, to appease, to obtain, and to satisfy, repairs in us the ruins of death by the mystery of the only Son. Arisen from the dead, the only Son dies no more, and death shall no more have any power over Him. He lives by Himself an immortal and incorruptible life, and it is He who is immolated for us in this mystery of the sacred oblation. Such is the pure oblation that no unworthiness, no perversity in those who offer it, can ever sully, and which, by the mouth of Malachy, the Lord has predicted "that the glory of His name become great among the nations, it shall be offered in its purity in every place from the rising to the setting of the sun." This oblation of an unspeakable fecundity embraces the present and the future life. By it, giving us the grace and gift of penance, God, who is appeased, remits even the most enormous crimes and sins, and, although grievously offended by our prevarication, He passes from anger to mercy, from a just severity to clemency—by it are equally remitted the temporal penalties due for the expiation of our faults—by it are relieved the souls of those who are dead, in union with Christ, without having been fully purified—by it also we receive the temporal goods which are not an obstacle to the goods of a superior order—by it is rendered to the saints, and above all to the Immaculate Most Holy Mary, Mother of God, the greatest honor and worship that she can receive. It is, therefore, that conformably to the traditions of the Apostles, we offer the divine sacrifice of the Mass "for the common peace of the Churches, for the good order of the world, for emperors, for warriors, for those who are united to us, for those who labor under sickness, for those who are oppressed with grief, for those in general who are in want, and for the dead detained in purgatory, believing that the greatest succor which those souls can receive is that which is here given them when we pray for them at the moment that the holy and formidable victim is im-



molated before us." There is nothing then, greater, more holy, more divine, than the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass, by which the same body, the same blood, the same Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, is offered and immolated on the altar, for the salvation of all, by the Priests, and it is for that reason that the Holy Mother, the Church, which is in possession of this treasure, so great, of her divine Spouse, has never ceased to employ all her care, all her zeal, all her vigilance, in order that this grand mystery may be accomplished by the Priests with the greatest interior purity of the heart, and in order that it might be celebrated with all the becoming appurtenances of worship according to the rules laid down by the Ritual, and the sacred ceremonies, in order that the grandeur and the majesty of the mystery itself may shine in the exterior appearance, and that thus the faithful may be excited to the contemplation of the divine things contained and hidden in so venerable a sacrifice. It is with the same ardor and the same solicitude that his pious mother, addressing herself to those faithful children, never ceases to bring to their minds, to exhort them, to inflame their zeal, to bring them frequently to this divine sacrifice with all the piety, all the respect, and all the devotion which it deserves—ordaining that all are absolutely held to assist at it on feast days of obligation, attending to it with a religious attention of eyes and of heart, in order that they may be happily enabled to obtain, by the value of the mercy of God, an abundance of all gifts.

#### FRANCE.—TRIAL OF M. DE MONTALEMBERT.

This gentleman, who occupied posts of more or less distinction under the government of Louis Philippe; who has been the adherent of all parties, and offended alike Legitimists, Orleanists, Republicans, and Bonapartists, and is now owned by none; who has been a zealous Ultramontanist, and is now arraigned, and tried, and condemned for his praise of constitutional principles; was, on the 24th of November, brought to trial before a petty Police Court for his Article in the *Correspondant*, entitled "*A Debate on India in the British Parliament.*" In this Article he was charged with exalting British institutions at the expense of the reigning dynasty of France. The trial attracted great attention. He was ably defended by the distinguished M. Berryer, yet the trial was as nearly secret as possible. The Procureur Imperial, M. Cordouen, said, "You have cast France down at England's feet, and there, there, you have struck her in the face. Your work is an impious one."

The Judges deliberated for an hour on their judgment, and then, with reasons duly set forth, passed sentence of six months' imprisonment and a fine of 6,000f. on the Count de Montalembert; and one month's imprisonment and a fine of 1,000f. on M. Douniol, the editor.

Louis Napoleon has remitted the sentence, but Montalembert insists on appealing to a higher Court. All this is only the beginning of the end, and a bitter end.

#### HOLLAND.—NEW PROTEST IN THE ROMISH CHURCH.

It is difficult not to laugh at, rather than seriously refute the pretensions of Modern Rome to Catholicity, Unity, Infallibility, &c. But manifestations are perpetually occurring in that sect, and in the better portions of it too, which are more hopeful. In the Church of Holland, there have recently appeared certain Pastoral Instructions, of the Roman Archbishop of Utrecht, and the Bishops of Haarlem and Deventer, concerning the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which are in the highest degree significant. We can only give an extract or two, enough to show the tone and character:

"The encyclical letter of the 8th of December, 1854, threatens the wrath of Almighty God, &c., to all who should dare to speak against, or even not to accept, the decision therein announced respecting the conception of the Virgin.

"How great soever may be our respect for his Holiness as head of the Church and the centre of Catholic unity, we should dread still more the displeasure of the Almighty if we blindly accepted such decision.



"St. Paul did not threaten the people of Berea with the displeasure of Almighty God when they searched the Scriptures to see if the things which were brought before them 'were so;' and St. Luke even confers upon them special honor.—'These were more noble than those of Thessalonica,' because they did so search. If this doctrine of the immaculate conception can be so thoroughly proved to be a doctrine of the Catholic Church as in such apostolic letter it is declared to be, there need no fear arise from such search; yea, rather ought an appeal to go forth inviting such a search, that it may be patent to the whole world that we are indebted to the care and zeal of Pius IX for this discovery."

"Inasmuch as we have no conviction that Pius has spoken an infallible word when he declared the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin to be a revealed truth of the Catholic faith, we feel it to be our duty to examine the grounds upon which such declaration rests.

"These grounds are said by him to be five:—

"1. Holy Scriptures.

"2. Sacred tradition.

"3. The continuous feeling of the Church.

"4. The wonderful unanimity of Catholic pastors and of the faithful.

"5. The illustrious acts and constitutions of his predecessors in the Papal chair."

After combatting the above grounds, they say, in reference to the fourth; "Where is this wonderful unanimity to be found? Naturally in the answers given by the Bishops to the encyclical letter addressed to them from Gaeta in 1849. The analysis justifies no such unanimity. The whole dogma of the Immaculate Conception being thus entirely new there need be no wonder that the mode of announcing it was entirely new. Never formerly were such utterances heard from a Pope's lips; formerly it was the congregated fathers who, after previous deliberations, &c., judged and determined. But it was on this occasion no Church Council, although, for the eye of the world, such a coloring was attempted to be given to it."

Under the fifth head of the Pastoral Instruction, reference is made to Gregory the Great, Innocent III and Innocent V, Clement VI, &c., to show that for fourteen centuries a doctrine was held in entire contradiction to that promulgated by Pius IX, and it is then said:—

"We leave it to every unprejudiced person to decide whether we have good ground for the strictures we have made, and whether we have proved or not that the Apostolic letter issued by Pius IX, on the 8th December, 1854, is simply a tissue (*zamenuweefsel*) of untruths, wherein the name of Scripture and sacred traditions are shamefully misapplied to exalt into matter of faith a mere matter of feeling or subjective impression, not even based on the lowest grade of probability.

"In conclusion, we solemnly declare before the whole world that the maxim, '*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*,' reaches neither in teaching nor in acceptance to this dogma of the Immaculate Conception; and we say to all Catholics, 'Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set.' (Proverbs xxii, 28.) 'But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.' (Gal. i, 8.) 'Remember how thou hast received and heard; and hold fast.' (Rev. iii, 3.)

"† JOHN, Archbishop of Utrecht.

"† HENRY JOHN, Bishop of Haarlem.

"† HERMAN, Bishop of Deventer."

As is generally known, the Bishops here protesting are Jansenists, whose connection with Rome is more nominal than real. A sort of visible unity is maintained, but the supremacy of the Pope in its modern sense is disowned.

#### IRELAND.—SECESSIONS FROM ROME.

So much is said in these days of the growth of Popery, and so little notice is taken of the crowds who are abandoning that system, that it may be worth while to record one fact of the many which are constantly transpiring. The *Limerick*



*Chronicle* says, that on Sunday, September 4th, in Ballingarry Church, Mr. John Condon having renounced the creed of Rome, was received by the Rev. George G. Gubbins into the Established Church. This makes the number who have conformed to the Protestant faith for some years past, in that parish or neighborhood, considerably over 300. Amongst them are to be reckoned two clergymen, one physician, five gentry, two mathematical teachers, fifteen schoolmasters, three classical teachers, five Scripture-readers, two shopkeepers, two clerks, thirteen tradesmen, besides farmers, policemen, stewards, gardeners, porters, soldiers, servants, laborers, &c. Some of the converts at Knockferna, who were lately driven by persecution to go to mass, have stated their resolution to return to the guardianship of the Protestant faith, from which they state they have never in heart departed.

#### RUSSIA.

There is no part of the civilized world which today is fuller of promise for the future than Russia, under the rule of Alexander II. His determination to emancipate the serfs, to elevate them to the rank of an estate of the realm, to give them their houses and their lands as their own, has aroused the jealousy and hostility of some of the nobility, especially the nobility of Moscow. But the Emperor is a man of resolution and courage, and is fully equal to the times. The nobility of Smolensk are with him heartily. Both Religion and Civilization have much to hope for from Alexander II, amid the waning prospects of Western Europe.

**THE CONVERSION OF CHINA.**—A large caravan of Russo-Greek missionaries started a month ago under the Archimandrite Goori for Peking. Russia will be first in the field of conversion.

#### MEXICO.

It is in vain to attempt to chronicle the changes which are continually taking place in this distracted country. All its troubles may be grouped under one division and labeled with one head. It is **POPEERY**, accursed **POPEERY**! which is nothing less than a mixture of Papism and Heathenism. For more than three hundred years it has had supreme control of the richest, finest country in the world, whose soil is exhaustless, and whose hills are full of silver and gold; and yet the whole country is now sinking under the curse of this abominable system. An able writer now in Mexico, says:

"The battle of Church and State had begun. Through the long course of centuries the Church had gradually become possessed of vast domains and increasing wealth, until now it was found that, under the guise of charitable bequests and religious appliances, it had secured upwards of one-half of all the property within the Republic."

"The actual present value of the Church property is estimated by LEON DE TEJADA, the most reliable authority, at two hundred and fifty to three hundred millions of dollars. In addition to the revenues from this, the Church also receives from 'tithes,' parochial dues, alms, masses, the sale of relics, &c., &c., some six to eight millions of dollars more, annually. Its gross revenues from all sources are estimated at not less than \$20,000,000 per annum. In the city of Mexico alone, of the five thousand houses, exclusive of religious edifices, more than one half belong to the Church."

"Why this power has not been even more fatal than it has, lies solely in the fact that a long career in the practice of every vice and immorality has so utterly demoralized and debased the Clergy of Mexico, that they are now left without the intellectual capacity to use or ably direct its vast elements within their control."

We have long since ceased to wonder over the horrors of the French Revolution; or at the bitter infidelity of Voltaire, and the French Encyclopedists.



AMERICAN QUARTERLY  
CHURCH REVIEW,  
FOR 1859.

---

EDITORIAL.

WE cannot but feel gratified at the evidences which continue to greet us, from all quarters, that the AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW is doing its work, quietly, but effectively. The Article on "Mixed Societies," in our last No., has been so loudly called for, that it will soon appear in a separate form. The Article on "Infant Baptism," in that No., and an unanswerable argument for that Rite, is reprinted in the (London) *Clerical Journal* of Nov. 8th. The (London) *Literary Churchman*, of Nov. 16th, notices at length the Article on the "Present State and Hopes of Christianity," and says, that the "writer shows a depth of thought which we are accustomed to meet with only amongst the most talented of our English writers," &c., &c. The "Letter to Bishop Lee," has stirred the hearts of Churchmen on our distant outposts, who call for the immediate application of some of the writer's suggestions. One earnest-minded Layman, in a rich and growing section of the Southwest, *who has not seen a Church Clergyman in eight years*, sends us statements of Church destitution which are enough to make "the stones cry out." In all parts of our country, alike, the East and the West, the North and the South, the opportunities of the Church were never so promising as at this present moment. Everywhere the conviction is spreading and deepening, that the PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH is essentially what CHRIST made, and meant His Church to be; that she is what the souls of men want to meet their spiritual necessi-



ties; and that she is that great Spiritual Element of true conservatism, and true progress, which the condition of American Society peculiarly, and imperatively, demands.

In bringing the Eleventh Volume of the Review to a conclusion, which we do with the present No., strongly tempted as we are to withdraw to a quieter field of labor, wearied and care-worn with an amount of service which might, we think, purchase for us such a relief, we are not quite ready yet to throw off the harness. But we need help. While our subscription list is larger than ever, our expenses have increased in equal proportion; so that, pecuniarily, we are wholly dependent on the friends of the work. We need two things especially. One is, prompt payments of subscriptions; and the other is, that those who appreciate the position of the Review, shall feel that they have a personal interest in making the work better known, and better sustained.

Will our friends give us their aid in both these particulars?

As for the future, we can only say, that, if we are not in the habit of depending on the newspaper puffs of "penny-a-liners;" and if we are honored, now and then, with the opposition of those whose theories of Society and of Social Reform differ fundamentally from our own; yet, that the list of pledged contributors to the AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW will not suffer in comparison, for talent, learning, and genius, with that of any Periodical in the country, literary or religious.



